

Journal of Sexology

and

Psychanalysis

Edited by
William J. Robinson, M. D., and S. A. Tannenbaum, M. D.

Volume I

JULY, 1923.

No. 4

ORIGINAL AND TRANSLATED ARTICLES

THE SEXUAL LIFE OF THE CHILD

By Dr. J. Sadger, Vienna.

(Translated by Dr. J. S. Van Teslaar.)

"What?" many a doubter will ask, "a sexual life of the child? Shall that paragon of purity be said to harbor feelings of a sexual character?"

"We do know there are among children certain corrupt ones who begin masturbating during their public school years, but, as a whole, children know nothing about sexual matters. One need only consider that the child's whole sexual apparatus is undeveloped; besides, the ultra-modern message of science, the doctrine of the endocrinic secretions, assumes that sexuality begins only with the onset of puberty. Where would those pure creatures get any such naughty feelings?"

It is hardly noticed that this reasoning implies the same fallacy often made in the case of young girls whose "ignorance" about sexual matters is mistaken for "purity." Indeed, the current general incredulity is due chiefly to a two-fold error. In the first place, the sexual instinct is identified with reproductive gratification or capacity, and, since the latter begins only with the onset of puberty, the child is thought to possess no sexual instinct. Of course, against this view stands the fact that though reproduction is bound up with sexual activity, as a matter of fact it represents but a relatively special determinant in the operation of the plurivalent sexual instinct. It may happen that a ruler desires an heir, or that even a common mor-

tal desires offspring so as to maintain his line, but ordinarily sexual activity is not determined by the desire for offspring. In the most ordinary cases sexual intercourse is indulged in without regard to such considerations; on the contrary, that seems, not infrequently, an unwelcome "blessing," to be avoided so far as possible. Expressing the matter boldly, intercourse, even during marriage, is indulged in chiefly on account of the pleasure in the act and not for any ideal ethical motives. Only moral hypocrisy maintains that the desire for reproduction alone is the decent motive for frequent cohabitation. Turning again to the child, one would have to prove that the child is wholly free from libidinous cravings in order to be justified in assuming that childhood is asexual. That this is not the case, I shall prove later on at length.

Next to confusing the reproductive instinct with sexual desire, another error is quite common; the assumption that *sexual* and *genital* are synonymous. The simple fact is that during man's most active period his sexual activity is chiefly linked with the function of the genitalia. On the other hand, a large amount of extra-genital sexual pleasure is easily traceable, even in the child. Briefly: what has been heretofore mistaken for the child's purity is merely ignorance about sexual matters; but sexual activity is neither identical with the ability to reproduce or bear children, nor is it necessarily linked to the functioning of the sexual organs proper.

But what leads us to the conviction that the pleasure of certain activities is truly sexual? In the first place the orgasm—the pleasure summation—known to any one who has once masturbated or who has once enjoyed sexual intercourse. In the second place, the discharge of sexuo-glandular products; and, finally, the process of reproduction consequent upon the pleasurable indulgence. Among these unquestionable criteria, however, the third one is not necessarily vital. Aside from the fact that intercourse is frequently indulged in distinctly with the intent of avoiding pregnancy, there are the so-called sexual perverts, whose doings are undoubtedly sexual, but who disregard, of course, the need for reproduction. Furthermore, the discharge of sexuo-glandular products is also not indispensable. We know, for instance, that during the normal sexual intercourse between man and woman, the former sometimes withholds the semen so as to avoid impregnating the woman; and in the case of the woman, too, the discharge of secreta may not take place in the end, either because she is frigid or perhaps because she

is not disposed to participate. Nevertheless, the pleasure summation, or, let us say, at least, the beginning thereof, the path, the disposition thereto, cannot be denied as a factor, if we assume the act to be at all of a sexual character. If we test the same doings among children, it is, of course, obvious that there can be no question here either of reproduction or of the discharge of sexual secreta, since the child is anatomically undeveloped as yet. At the same time orgasm need not necessarily be absent, or at least the disposition thereto, as I shall prove later on through numerous actual instances. That is one decisive fact justifying us in assuming a sexual life of the child.

Before proceeding further with this theme, I may offer a generalization. Whoever is interested in studying particular disorders, finds, of course, that extreme cases offer the clearest examples. The clinical picture of abdominal typhus, for instance, is not to be observed in abortive cases, but in as severe and extreme a case as possible; again, the symptomatology of multiple sclerosis is not obtainable in a *forma frustra*, but can be formulated only on the basis of a number of classical examples. Only after having sharpened our vision through the observation of large numbers of pronounced and advanced forms do we find it easy to diagnose even rudimentary clinical pictures, and are able, for instance, to proceed to the diagnosis of the insular form of sclerosis, in cases where a less experienced diagnostician might be unable to recognize that spinal disorder. Applying this observation to our theme, we may recognize the sexuality of the child not on the basis of doubtful, or rudimentary, manifestations thereof, but so far as possible in connection with the most pronounced symptoms, which, moreover, present the additional advantage that their sexual origin is too obvious to admit of controversy.

As the most obvious manifestation I select

GENITAL MASTURBATION.

Many among us recall the so-called "bad boys" of our earlier school days who were inordinately addicted to the habit. That this childhood masturbation originates in the sexual instinct and that it yields pleasurable feelings of a sexual character, in spite of the absence of spermatic fluid and even though reproduction is out of the question, no one, of course, will be disposed to deny. But this habit is known to be widespread only among the larger boys—those who already sit on the school benches. For the sake of thoroughness I may mention in passing, that

according to the unanimous observations of educators, masturbation is not infrequently found also among girls of school age.

The masturbation theme did not seem relevant in connection with children of the pre-school age, and not at all in connection with infants. A great sensation was roused in the medical world, therefore, when Prof. Hirschsprung, the Danish pediatricist, in 1886, *i. e.*, long before Freud's first essay on this theme, published, under the title, *Über die Onanie bei kleinen Kindern* (On Masturbation among young children) an article which was reproduced in the *Berliner klinische Wochenschrift* (Sept. 20, 1886, No. 38). The great stir it created will be understood better if I reproduce verbatim the introductory paragraph of that essay:

"I was extremely astonished," writes Hirschsprung, "when I learned for the first time—through Vogel's *Textbook of Children's Diseases*—that masturbation may be indulged in even during infancy. Later on, in connection with consultations about young children who masturbated, I became convinced that my colleagues were as ignorant as I myself had been, and that they had been overlooking the uncommonly typical picture of the masturbating child. Characteristically enough, it was a couple of physicians who first consulted me about their own children, and in both instances it happened that the physician-parent was unable (*i. e.* unwilling) to agree with my diagnosis of the case under consideration. As a matter of fact this is explainable. *A priori* we are inclined to assume that a certain degree of physical and mental development is absolutely essential for the awakening of the sexual instinct, that the instinct may be roused prematurely under certain environmentally unhealthy influences but an aberration to the extent of finding its manifestation, and the gratification of the instinctive craving, during the first childhood years, and that without any deleterious environmental influences whatsoever—that is something we find ourselves unprepared to grasp. Nevertheless there is not the least doubt possible that precisely such is the fact. My experience is wide enough to corroborate the experiences and conclusions of others and to justify me in upholding their relevance."

Upon reading this account, we are impressed first of all by the fact that Hirschsprung himself, so thorough-going a specialist, was "astonished" to find infantile masturbation mentioned in a textbook of Children's Diseases; furthermore, that he was not disinclined to believe it, and finally that a medical colleague was unwilling to be convinced when the habit was proven over-

whelmingly in the case of his own child. These facts repeat themselves—*mutatis mutandis*—in our psychoanalytic experience to this day.

In order to illustrate how intensely physicians themselves resist the idea of infantile masturbation even when they find it mentioned in professional literature, I shall add to this point a couple of pertinent observations. Hirschsprung describes his first clinical case, a girl infant, 13 months, addicted to masturbation, and remarks: "It is said that the child had already suffered from the spells (*i. e.* the manifestation of its onanistic indulgence) as early as between 8-9 months, *but this must seem doubtful.*"

Vogel, who in his Textbook (1870) mentions the Krafft-Ebing case, adds the following comment: "This account is unique; it raises the question whether the child did not suffer from a mild skin eruption; or it might have had a little foreign body in its vagina, and in that case its pelvic motions may be assumed to have been due to a simple itching (the girl of 11 months during its spells thrust its hands successively into the vulva, rubbing the parts more and more vigorously, flexed its limbs, the facial expression became intense, and it uttered a loud gurgle." The thing seemed to him so incredible that he preferred to think of a possible external cause, though Krafft-Ebing himself would have mentioned it, had any such factor been present. Fleischmann, who recorded two masturbating infants of suckling age (*Ueber Onanie und Masturbation bei Säuglingen*, Wiener Presse, 1875) two years before Hirschsprung, began his contribution as follows: "When the ancient Onan discovered the habit which later was to be designated by his name, he little thought that through continual inheritance, the human species, down to the sucklings, will eventually acquire the habit, and that, in conformity with the eternally valid truism that "imitation is the most sincere flattery", the little ones too would join his sect. What? one may ask, self-abuse in infants? Certainly—as the following observations disclose. I have had under observation two closely successive cases which on account of their rarity no less than on account of their curious character ought to rouse the interest of our professional colleagues (what a naive remark: '*Les savants ne sont pas curieux!*' says Anatole France) and therefore I have decided to publish this account of them."

Finally, Huebner, who has also written about infantile masturbation in his *Textbook of Children's Diseases* (1911), concludes his remark as follows: "In certain cases there can be

no question of seduction or bad example, though we cannot escape the assumption that there is such a factor as a predisposition to the habit, as may be observed, of course, in the animal world as well as among degenerates—individuals psychically weak, idiots, cretins—and it must be counted among the surest signs of degeneration. (?!) I refer to the curious instances, which seem unbelievable, unless one has had already the opportunity of observing them, where the habit is indulged in by sucklings during the first months of life." In that connection he describes the case of a boy, six months old at the time, already addicted to masturbation, who, according to his nurse's account, displayed very marked erections already on the ninth day. "Then the boy starts rubbing and pressing his membrum between the legs until he turns red in the face and his whole body breaks out in a sweat."

These proofs show that even our pediatricists are but little aware of the prevalence of early infantile masturbation. One of the latest monographs on the subject, by Eugen Neter, contains a comprehensive survey of the literature, covering the period since 1779, and, including also the American contributions, it contains no more than 15 references—and that in an age when columns of writing are devoted to the least of symptomatic manifestations.

What is the reason for this ignorance and for this reticence? Sucklings and infants must have masturbated always, for it is not to be assumed that the habit started at about the time when Hirschsprung wrote his essay on the theme. How was it possible, then, for this habit to escape so completely the attention of all the more or less clever medical observers to be found in every age so that the fact remained to be revealed only towards the close of the Nineteenth Century as something new? It would seem that Struempel's remark holds true: "Most physicians see only what they have been taught to see." But every age has had its exceptional minds, capable of seeing beyond what was set down in textbooks! Why has nobody recognized infantile masturbation—why has none among them at least deliberately set about to observe it? There must have been in the way some hindrance stronger than the customary mortmain of medical precedent. This leads us back to the dogma about the child's aboriginal purity, mentioned at the beginning, a dogma that has completely blinded our medical practitioners. For them, too, infantile sexual feelings must have been something to be avoided, an evil blot upon the purity of the child—specifi-

SEXUAL LIFE OF THE CHILD—SADGER

cally in connection with their own childhood. It was something no one could afford to see and therefore it led to the habit of not seeing that which the unprejudiced eye could have perceived any day. For, as I shall have occasion to point out again: no one is so blind as he who does not want to see.

The widespread prevalence of infantile masturbation became first revealed when Freud broke through the fixed prejudice of the thinking portion of the medical ranks with his *Three Contributions to the Sexual Theory*. The practice was shown up directly as an everyday occurrence not only by the Freudian school. Max Kassowitz, too, in his *Praktische Kinderheilkunde* (Berlin, 1910, p. 624) also refers to "the frequent occurrence of a premature sexual libido displayed by the children of both sexes, but particularly among boys," and then adds: "We must admit unconditionally that the authors who, like Freud, Stekel, etc., hold that the significance of infantile sexuality has heretofore been overlooked, are right. It is certain that even healthy sucklings, not infrequently—much to the surprise of the mother—exhibit erections during sleep; and during the soporous stage of meningitis, the tendency of the child's hands to touch the genitalia is observed almost with the regularity of a reflex action. Equally positive and well known to all observers is the occurrence of attempts at masturbation during the earliest stages of childhood not only among boys but also—though perhaps more rarely—among girls. These attempts assume the most varied forms. Besides manipulations with the hands, there may be indulgence in friction by crossing the limbs, occasionally also coitus-like motions while lying on the abdomen, as I have had occasion to observe in the case of a boy of five who apparently carried out the motions during sleep. All these various periods of sexual excitation have in common the feature that the children, unless interrupted in the act, induce in themselves thereby an orgasmic state, as is shown by the flushed face, the hurried breathing and the subsequent state of exhaustion."

I want to quote another pediatricist who also does not belong to the Freudian ranks. Eugen Neter, in his study entitled, *Die Masturbation im vorschulpflichtigen Alter* (Archiv f. Kinderheilk., vol. 60/61, 1913) states: "My clinical data cover 26 cases of masturbation during earliest childhood. In all these cases the habit is traceable back to the first year, or back to the third semester at least. The largest number of masturbating children and infants were girls (18 of the 26). The children under observation were of the average normal type, having

been brought to me on account of acute diseases, occasionally for chronic disorders (rachitis, enuresis, etc.). The habit had been hardly noticed by the parents and almost never properly recognized as masturbation. In a number of instances the children were brought to me on account of peculiar "spells" or "cramps," which anamnesis or direct observation easily revealed to be typical onanistic indulgences. Though the sexual character of these "spells" did not seem clear to the parents, they, and particularly the mothers, displayed an uncanny sort of uneasiness, as a fear of something unknown—plainly: *they suspected the sexual character of the "spells,"* but repulsed any such idea, because the age of the child seemed to preclude the possibility of anything sexual being the matter with them. The clinical histories failed to reveal anything significant in an etiologic sense. No manipulation of the children's genitalia by ignorant nurses, as a means of lulling the children to sleep, or through perverse inclination, could be traced. Phimosis, worms, intertrigo, or other factors capable of mechanically inducing the habit I have not found present in the cases more often than usual. The genitalia displayed no anomaly of etiologic import. Neither the anamnesis nor the objective examination and continued clinical observation revealed any relationship between the early onset of the masturbation habit and nervous hereditary taint, or any neuropathic constitution, respectively. Among some of the children a marked awakening of the sexual life was shown by the display of sympathy and allied emotions along with the occurrence of the process of physical detumescence." I emphasize from this account that the children who displayed the masturbation habit did not belong to a pathological ancestry or environment, but were healthy, in the ordinary sense, that their parents suspected the sexual character of the children's "spells," or "cramps," but had always carefully repressed this knowledge, and, finally, that some of these masturbating children displayed a precocious unfoldment of their love life.

Let us now turn our attention to an investigator of the Freudian school. Joseph K. Friedjung (*Die Onanie, Beiträge zu einer Diskussion der Wiener Psychoanalytischen Vereinigung*, 1912) declares that during his two years' experience at the children's out-patient clinic he has observed 45 cases of infantile masturbation. The importance of this figure is heightened by the fact that the estimate is probably too small. In fact, the author had not directly inquired about the occurrence of the habit among the children brought to the clinic but merely

noted cases where masturbation seemed "an occasional accompaniment," and in such instances the adults afterwards admitted the fact, though not always without a show of resistance against acknowledging it. "In most of these instances I was impressed by the children's inclination to handle the genitalia in the course of the necessary physical examination. I assume that nurses, and other physicians as well, must meet such experiences no less frequently. That the fact is so seldom pointed out may be due to the prevalence among the observers of a psychic blind spot or scotoma, a common phenomenon with which psychoanalysts are well familiar. Among the 35 children under my observation, 18 were boys, 17 girls. The sexes seem about equally involved; 29 belonged to the first four years of age; the incidental observations imply in most of these cases the absence of that sense of shame which regularly begins to assert itself beyond the age of three. The youngest of the children in my series of observations was just passing the third month. In most of these cases, the onset was not foreshadowed by any noteworthy psychic accompaniments and there was no erection. The occurrence was a mere play, if any one may thus call it. In a few cases the boys displayed erections, while the girls showed a "pleased countenance;" some displayed orgasms to the point of having an outbreak of perspiration, and becoming listless, or even insensitive to pinching. Two girl babies indulged in similar manipulations around their umbilicus; one of them became angry when hindered."

Here we have a brief description of the symptoms of infantile sexual orgasm accompanying masturbation and it is similar to that given in connection with the earlier cases of Krafft-Ebing, Heubner, and Kassowitz, except that here we have only the rudimentary forms of the habit manifestation: the erection and the changed facial expression. This clinical picture I want to round out by a few additional characteristic traits. Thus Hirschsprung describes a "spell" of one of his masturbating children, a girl infant of 13 months: "The onset was fairly typical: the child made a number of jerky up and down motions of the pelvis, holding its limbs stretched in parallel extension. It kept working continually, then stopped still, face flushed, the pupils dilated, now and then the face was distorted with grimaces, sighing and plaintive sobbing—the latter was taken as a sign of pain. During the spell the child looked at me with hungry, glazy eyes—I was standing by very close—though the instant before it did not tolerate my presence."

Ludwig Fleischmann describes similarly the appearance of a male suckling in the act of masturbating: "The penis hardened and swelled to the size of a little finger. The face started flushing, the eyes became glazed, at the same time the facial expression indicated the excitation of the nervous system. During the height of the orgasm the child blinked its eyes, thrust its hands into its mouth and tossed its head to right and left, forwards and backwards; during the spell the child was deaf and unresponsive to its parents' frantic appeals and pappings."

Neter's account is perhaps the most thorough: "The behaviour described as masturbation in children and infants leaves no doubt as to its onanistic character in the mind of the eye witness: strong incessant rhythmic frictions of the genitalia, increased excitation with exclusion of external stimuli, eyes gradually dilating, becoming fixed and shining, change in the character of the breathing, marked flushing of the face and, finally, after the act has attained a certain summation, marked and sudden fatigue and a return of ready response to external stimuli, whereas during the spell all such stimuli are resented with a show of impatience. The condition is something more than a so-called 'state of euphoria;' we are here confronted with a definite summation, an undoubted orgasm, suggesting analogy with the typical experiences belonging to a later age. During such onanistic indulgence the very young children do not always attain such an acme of gratification; nevertheless in all such cases the friction of the genitalia must be regarded as more than a mere accidental or asexual mannerism. The onanistic act occurs usually without the participation of the hands; but occasionally some of the children under my observation have also made use of the hand in rousing the genitalia during the onanistic act. As a rule the friction of the genitalia is carried out by pressing together the thighs, or by rubbing against some foreign body. I have seen the very youngest masturbators who have barely learned to sit up, indulge in a shaking or rhythmic forward bending of their body while in a sitting posture, the thighs being pressed tightly together at the same time; these motions, continued through an astonishingly long period, lead sooner or later to an orgasm and end in sleep; most children displayed a very pronounced tendency to indulge in the habit, so that nothing short of physical restraint could prevent it; once the act was begun, neither distraction of the attention nor punishments had any effect whatever."

Surveying, next, the symptoms observed in connection with

SEXUAL LIFE OF THE CHILD—SADGER

infantile masturbation and orgasm), we find, approximately: various rhythmic motions of the body (with or without the aid of the hand) intended to exert friction upon the genitalia, marked flushing of the face, rapid breathing, change in the appearance of the eyes, which open wide, become fixed and assume a peculiar glaze, increased excitability, anger at any interruption, suspension of sensitiveness to all external stimuli down to complete disregard of pinching or other painful sensory impressions, finally all sorts of grimaces and facial contortions and, at the height of the excitation, various outcries, an outbreak of profuse perspiration, followed immediately by sleepiness. The whole picture obviously corresponds to the orgasms of puberty or of complete sexual maturity, excepting that the seminal ejaculation is lacking in boys. Noteworthy is Hirschsprung's remark that a child which previously did not tolerate him at all, during the height of the orgasm gazed at him with hungry, glassy eyes, probably because it was fixed on the image of some other beloved person or else because during the height of the orgasm everything else was obscured by the love craving.

One thing seems to me now undeniable: infantile masturbation is without any doubt a sexual act and a direct proof that the child, even as an infant, already has the capacity to entertain sexual feelings. It is thus clear: man's sexual feelings do not begin with puberty, nor even during later childhood days—these feelings may be found already in the infant; indeed, as we shall soon learn, this as a rule is actually the case with our infants. And if I dwell to such an extent upon these pleasurable symptoms of infantile euphoria I do so because they are undeniably of a sexual character and will serve us as material with which to compare and test other erotic phenomena of a less manifestly sexual character.

Another feature revealed by Friedjung's account deserves special emphasis: the infantile orgasm does not always yield the complete picture with all the attendant symptoms as described above. There are also a number of rudimentary manifestations, one might call them *formae frustres*, down to the mere "pleased countenance" and a characteristic laughter, which loom up likewise as distinctly sexual, either because of a similar origin (masturbation of the genitalia), or because of some other attendant specific manifestation, or else because of their analogy with the complete form of the indulgence. Even in such instances as when children indulge stubbornly in some particular form of "naughtiness," as we shall see later—including also cer-

tain disease symptoms—and when neither reward nor punishments, neither threats nor promises, are capable of weaning them, the suspicion is nearly always justified that the “naughtiness” in question is of a sexual character, and it nearly always proves correct. Only when back of some peculiarity, as its true cause, there stands something sexual, does every such attempt at cure prove useless—excepting, of course, in cases involving proven organic changes.

[To be continued.]

ANIMISM AND NARCISM

(A Psycho-analytic Study.)

By Leo Kaplan, Zürich, Switzerland.

Mankind has at all times assumed in addition to the "palpable" reality surrounding it a second, a non-palpable, i. e., a supernatural, supersensory world. The question inevitably arises, what induced mankind to do this? what motives conduced to bring this about? Some investigators believe they have found these motives in the general conditions of knowledge. Thus, for example, Max Müller is of the opinion that our perceptions are constantly encountering bounds beyond which they cannot pass. "It is just this consciousness of the limits of our ability to perceive that gives us the certainty of a world beyond this one; inasmuch as we feel this boundary we also feel what lies on the other side of this boundary." (*Idem*, p. 206.) It is true that limited knowledge presupposes the unlimited, the infinite. And thus we would have come to the concept of "a world on the other side of the border"; but the "supernatural" is not merely an endlessly vast emptiness—it is peopled with supernatural beings of all sorts.

Positive science, too, is not content merely to register the palpable facts; it strives rather to conceive of phenomena as the expression of certain laws, inasmuch as it applies to them the law of causality. Science is constantly overstepping the realm of facts as registered immediately by the senses. Let us compare this with religious thinking. "Both (religion and science)," says Max Müller, "occupy themselves with what lies behind or beyond the boundaries of our sensory knowledge. Science seeks for the causes of the facts, whatever they may be;

religion contents itself with assuming active agencies to account for occurrences, and these agencies take on various shapes according to the poetical genius of the various races." There is, then, a mode of thinking which seeks for active beings behind every occurrence. We shall designate this mode of thought as animism¹ and explore its genesis as well as its inner nature.

To postulate active agencies behind the occurrences of the objective world is really to think of the world as having one's own image.² "Mankind is the measure of all things,"—an ancient philosophical maxim which applies perfectly to animism. "Inasmuch as we know only one state of being, viz.: our own, . . . how can we predicate of external objects anything as a state of being that would differ from our own?" (Müller, *Thinking and Speech*, 1888, p. 303.) But this explanation, plausible as it may sound, assumes precisely what it sets out to explain. For even though to animistic man his own being was the thing he knew best, we of to-day live in an age in which we seem to know more about external nature than about our inner life. We are in possession of a well-organized and richly developed natural science whose methods of investigation are very precise and which has made a large part of nature subservient to mankind. That which we call "psychology" and deals with our own being is still a problem. And the dominant psychology takes the natural sciences for its pattern. It seems, therefore, that to us, contrary to animistic man, our own being is less known than external nature, and that because of this we frequently manifest a tendency to explain our own states on the analogy of the occurrences in the objective world. Inasmuch as ordinarily we are best acquainted with what we are most interested in, the above difference is to be attributed to a displacement of interest: animistic man was most interested in himself, but for us, on the contrary, more interest attaches to the world of things (objects) than to what is personal. What, we must inquire, determines this difference in the affective attitude to the world and to personality?

We are inclined to view the overvaluation of the personal as a narcissistic trait. Narcism is a transitional stage in the individual's evolution from auto-eroticism to object eroticism. "In the primitive (infantile) auto-erotic phase it is a matter of the functioning of individual erogenous zones. In the course of development, one of these erogenous zones, to wit: the genital zone, acquires the preponderance and the other erogenous zones become

this one's servants. (End-pleasure and fore-pleasure). In the place of the partial impulses we now have a unified impulse which seems to be directed towards a sexual object. Narcism has this in common with object-eroticism that it too, unlike pure auto-eroticism, represents a unified impulse which is directed towards an (imaginary) object, to wit: the duplicate of the subject himself." (Kaplan, *Psycho-analytische Probleme*, 1916, p. 168.) A narcissist is a dual being: a lover and a beloved at the same time, or, metaphysically speaking, the individual consists of a body and a soul, for originally the soul is only a copy of the body. This dual being naturally lives in a dual world: in a corporeal world and in a non-corporeal (super-sensory) world. What in the intellectual sphere is called animism is, affectively considered, narcissism.

Just as we over-estimate the object of our love, i. e., a sexual object, so the narcissist over-estimates his ego and with it everything that is personal. He must, therefore, make man—the subject—the measure of all things, i. e., make the experiences of the "mental life" the basis for an understanding of all other experiences. That means, again, to assume active beings as the cause of actions.

The tendency hitherto has been to explain the animistic philosophy as the result of the poverty of primitive experience. Lippert, for example, thinks that primitive man regarded soul and body as two separate things because of the phenomenon of death. In several languages the soul is identified with the breath; in Greek it is *pneuma*; in Russian *duch*, in Latin *spiritu*, in Hebrew *odem*. Folk-physiology could not think of death differently "than as resulting from the departure of an impalpable but powerful essence." (J. Lippert, *Der Seelenkult in seinen Beziehungen zur althebräisch. Religion*, Berlin, 1881, p. 9.) In this explanation of animism the author assumes, without knowing it, what he sets out to explain. Why should the breath as a manifestation of life be brought into association with a mighty essence?—therein lies our problem. If one is accustomed to see active persons behind all occurrences, life seems to be the work of a life-endowing essence and then death is the natural sequel to this essence's departure from the body. Whether this essence is then thought of as the breath or as something else is a matter of secondary significance.

Another theory attempts to explain animism by reference to dreams as these must appear to the untutored mind of primitive man. In dreams man often sees persons acting who not only are not present, but even who have been dead a long time.

Dreams, says Lippert, are looked upon as something coming from without. According to this assumption the reappearance of a dead person in a dream must be a proof of his continued existence. "The individual who returns in a dream really proves to the untrained critical faculties of primitive man that he has not ceased to exist." (Ib., p. 14.) The assumption that a dream is something that comes from without presupposes that primitive man was incapable of distinguishing between "dream" and "reality" and attached to hallucinations the value of realities. But such a psychic constitution would deprive primitive man of the ability to correct his views about reality. For how was he to convince himself that the dead person he was looking at was only a phantom of his mind and not an actual reality? On the contrary, if the dead one is only a "departed spirit," a phantom, then his "appearance" is something quite natural, not contradictory to the real relations of things, and there is no difference in principle between dream and reality. We see, then, that the assumption that a dream is something from without, i. e., the inability to distinguish between dream and reality, is equivalent to the basic assumption underlying animism.

More often primitive man regards the dream as evidence of his soul having left his body to wander about the world and experience various adventures. Thus, for example, Brihadaranyaka (*Upanishad*, 4, 3, 9-14) says: "Rejecting what belongs to the body in sleep, sleepless as he looks on the sleeping organs; Borrowing their light, the golden spirit, the lone wanderer, returns to its place again."

"The humble nest, the abode of life, he leaves, And, immortal, wings his way aloft out of his nest; Immortal, he roams where he pleases, The golden spirit, the lone wanderer,"—"Only his playground here do we behold, Him nobody here can see." (Cf. Paul Deussen's *History of Philosophy*, vol. 1, part 2, p. 272.)

In this version the narcissic-animistic basis of the primitive theory of dreams is even more clearly apparent. It is not a false view of dreams that begets animism; but, on the contrary, the animistic assumption of the soul's independent existence (which is itself the expression of man's narcissic dual being) that deceives man into looking upon dreams as objective happenings.

The narcissic-animistic frame of mind seeks for points of support in external reality. Most frequently it finds this support in shadows and mirrored reflections in the water, etc. We are familiar with the Greek story of the handsome youth Nar-

cissus who saw his image in the water and fell violently in love with it. We are familiar with the attribution of all the virtues to the one we love. A perfect being must, of course, have existence. That is why shadows and reflections are looked upon as veritable realities. "In popular belief the mirrored image of a person (is) not an optical phenomenon but a real, even though an ethereal, embodiment . . ." and the mirror is regarded as a "container of the spirit realm." "Occasionally the human double is thought of as lingering in the mirror; it is therefore forbidden for survivors who have lost by death a member of the family to project their images into a mirror in which the deceased's shadow is supposed to dwell." (J. v. Negelein, *Bild, Spiegel u. Schatten im Volksglauben*, Archiv. f. Religionswiss., vol. 5, pp. 25, 26.) The "soul" which under such circumstances is projected into "the spirit realm" may possibly be retained there by the deceased's spirit inhabiting there.

A Vedic tale incorporates in one all the various forms which narcissism (animism) may assume. We reproduce Müller's version of this tale (*Khandogya-Upanishad*, 8, 7-12) as we find it in his lectures on religion (pp. 367-73):

"Prajapâti speaks: 'the self that is free from sin, from age, from death and sorrow, from hunger and from thirst, that wants for nothing but what it should want, thinks nothing but what it should think, that self we must try to understand. One who has found that self and understood it has attained all worlds and all desires.'"

The Devas and the Asuras heard these words and said: "Very well; let us seek this self by which, when one has found it, all worlds and all desires are attained."

With these words Indra went from the Devas and Virokana from the Asuras and, without having agreed upon this beforehand, stepped up to Prajapâti, each holding a piece of wood in his hand, as is the custom when pupils approach their teacher. They had lived there as pupils for two and thirty years. Then Prajapâti asked them: "Wherefore have you two lived here?"

They said: "We have been acquainted with your opinion that we must find and try to understand the Self that is free from sin, from age, from death and sorrow, from hunger and thirst, which desires nothing but what it should desire and thinks nothing but what it should think, and that one who has found this Self and understood it, has attained all worlds and all desires. Only because we have wished for this Self have we lived here so long."

Prajapâti said to them: "The person that is beheld in the

eye is the Self. This is what I said; this is the immortal, the fearless—this is Brahman."

They said: "Master, is it that which one beholds in the water and in mirrors?" He answered: "Yes, he is seen in all these things. Look at your Self in a cup of water and then come and tell me what of your Self you do not understand!"

They said: "We both see the Self completely, *an image even to our very hair and nails.*"

Prajapâti said to them: "After you have put on your jewels and your best attire and have adorned yourselves look again into the cup of water."

After they had put on their jewels and their best attire and adorned themselves, they looked into the cup of water. Prajapâti said: "What do you see?" They said: "Just as we are, adorned with our jewels and in our best attire, so are we both there, Master, adorned with our jewels and in our best attire."

Prajapâti said: "That is the Self, the immortal, the fearless, the Brahman." Thereupon both went away with a merry heart.

But Prajapâti looked after them and said: "Both went away without having grasped or understood the Self, and any one, be it a Deva or an Asura, who follows the teaching (*Upanishad*) of either of them will suffer ruin."

Virokana now went with a merry heart to the Asuras and preached this doctrine to them: that only the Self (the body) must be celebrated, that only the Self must be worshipped, and that one who celebrates and worships this Self attains both worlds, this as well as the next.

That is why even to-day one who has no belief and brings no sacrifices is called an Asura, for this is the teaching of the Asuras. They adorn the body of a deceased with flowers and garments for adornment, and believe thus to attain the next world.

But before Indra returned to the Devas he saw this difficulty. "As this Self (the reflection in the water) is beautifully adorned, beautifully clothed when the body is beautifully clothed, nicely dressed up when the body is nicely dressed up, so the Self will also be blind when the body is blind, lame when the body is lame, crippled when it is crippled, and it will die when the body dies. What good is this teaching to me?"

So he took another stick of wood in his hand and went again to Prajapâti. Prajapâti said to him: "Maghavat (Indra), you went away with a merry heart with Virokana, why do you come back again?" He said: "Master, as this Self (the reflection in the water) is beautifully adorned when the body is beautifully

adorned, beautifully attired when the body is beautifully attired, beautifully dressed up when the body is beautifully dressed up, so the Self will be blind when the body is blind, lame when the body is lame, crippled when the body is crippled, it will die as soon as the body dies. What good does this teaching do me?"

"That is indeed so, Maghavat," replied Prajapâti, "but I shall explain the true Self to you more fully. Live with me another two and thirty years!"

He lived with him another two and thirty years. Then Prajapâti said:

"He who wanders about happily in his dreams is the Self; that is the immortal, the fearless, that is Brahman."

Then Indra went away merry-hearted. But before he returned to the Devas he saw this difficulty. Although it is true that this Self is not blind when the body is blind, is not lame when the body is lame, although it is true that this Self is not made infirm by the body's infirmities, nor bruised when the body is bruised, nor lame when the body is lame, none the less it is as if one were beaten in dreams, as if it were driven away. It feels pain but forgets to weep. Of what use is this teaching to me?"

So he took a stick of wood in his hand and went again as a pupil to Prajapâti. Prajapâti said to him: "Maghavat, you went away merry-hearted; why do you come back again?"

He said: "Master, although it is true that this Self is not blind when the body is blind, is not lame when the body is lame; although it is true that this Self is not made infirm by the body's infirmities, nor is it bruised when the body is beaten, nor lame when the body is lame, none the less it is as if it were beaten in dreams and as if it were driven away. And he feels pain but forgets to weep. Of what use is this teaching to me?"

"So it is, indeed, Maghavat," replied Prajapâti, "but I shall explain the true Self to you more fully. Live with me another two and thirty years."

He lived with him another two and thirty years. Then Prajapâti said: "When a man has fallen asleep, has been gathered together and has sunk into a perfect peace and no longer sees any dreams, that is the Self, that is the immortal, the fearless—that is Brahman."

Then Indra went away merry-hearted. But before he came back to the Devas he saw this difficulty. "Verily, so he could no longer be his own Self, that it is I, nor these beings; it has wholly perished. Of what use is this teaching to me?"

So he took a stick of wood and went again as a pupil to Pra-

japâti. Prajapâti said to him: "Maghavat, you went away with a merry heart; why do you come again?"

He said: "Master, verily, so he can no longer be his Self, that it is I, nor these beings; he has wholly perished. Of what use is this teaching to me?"

"So it is indeed, Maghavat," replied Prajapâti, "but I shall explain it (the Self) to you more fully and then no more. Live with me another five years!"

He lived there another five years, making a total of one hundred and one years, and that is why we still say that Indra Maghavat lived with Prajapâti as his pupil for one hundred and one years. Prajapâti said to him:

"Maghavat, *this body is mortal, always subservient to death. It is the residence of the Self which is immortal and bodiless.* As long as the Self dwells in the body (during which time it thinks 'I am this body') it is subject to pleasure and to pain. As long as it is in the body it cannot escape pleasure and pain. But when it is freed from the body, when it knows that it has departed from the body, then neither pleasure nor pain concerns him."

"The wind is bodiless; the cloud, the lightning and the thunder are bodiless (without hands, feet, etc.). Just as these, ascending from the heavenly ether, appear in their own shape as soon as they approach the supreme Light, so also appears this blessed Self, ascended from the body, in its own shape as soon as it approaches the supreme Light (of knowledge)."

"It is then the supreme person, the supreme subject. It wanders about laughing (eating) playfully and merrily with women, a carriage and friends, never thinking of the body it was born with."

"As a horse is harnessed to a wagon, so the spirit is harnessed to the body."

"When the faculty of vision has stepped into the empty space (the pupil of the eye), then it is the person, the subject of the eye—the eye itself is only the tool of sight. He who knows I would like to say, is the Self, the tongue is only the tool. He who knows I would like to hear, is the Self, the ear is only the tool."

"He who knows I would like to think, he is the self; the soul is his divine eye. He, the Self, sees these joys (which are hidden from others as a buried treasure) with his divine eye, the soul, and is happy."

"The Devas in the world of Brahman worship this Self (as Prajapâti taught this to Indra and Indra to the Devas). There-

ANIMISM AND NARCISM—KAPLAN

in they have attained all worlds and all desires. He who knows and understands this Self, attains all worlds and all desires." Thus said Prajapâti."

To the Hindu the highest and most valuable object of knowledge is the Self (Atman); one who has found and comprehended it has attained all worlds and desires. To attain such knowledge one does not object to an educational period as long as that of Indra which lasted one hundred years.

What is the Self? Primarily an "image to the very hair and nails," a human being's double; then he "who wanders about in dreams," i. e., one who wanders about in the world while "his" body lies somewhere apparently motionless, like dead, the "immortal" one.

These ideas correspond to the concept of the (mortal) body as the (temporary) "residence of the Self which is immortal and bodiless." The Self appears in its "own shape" when it "has ascended from the body." Then it is "the supreme subject," that wanders about "laughingly, playfully and merrily, with women, a carriage and friends." The ascent from the body really signifies the projection of the ego outward, whereby, as it seems, there is created a highly pleasurable state which can be explained only as narcissism.

If the Self is different from the body and can be known only in the "supreme Light," a question arises as to the rôle played by the body. The latter is only the tool of the Self, the tool wherewith the Self enters into rapport with the sensory world. What this means appears from the distinction between the eye (as a tool) and the subject of the eye. Behind every occurrence the animist beholds an acting agent.

The Self is also sought in sleep. "When a person has fallen asleep, been gathered up and laid to rest, that is the Self." For the better comprehension of this statement, it will be well to quote the following from *Brihadaranyaka-Upanishad*, 4, 3, 19, 21:

"But just as in aerial space an eagle or a falcon, after it has been flying about, wearily folds its wings and glides to a perch, so too the spirit hastens to that condition in which, having fallen asleep, it perceives no desires and sees no dream images. That is its essential form—a form in which it is above desire, free from ills and without fear. For, just as one who is in the embrace of a woman has no consciousness of what goes on within or without, so the spirit in the embrace of the knowing Self has no consciousness of what goes on within or without. That is its essential form, in which its desires are stilled, even its

desire being without desire, and its sorrows gone." (*Die Geheimlehre d. Veda*. Her v. Paul Deussen; 1907, p. 57.)

Deep sleep is here characterized as the condition in which the Self (the ego) is wholly shut off from the outer world and seeks shelter in itself ("Introversion"). By this turning away from the outer world (by means of introversion, by withdrawing the libido from objective reality) one is restored to the narcissistic phase.

Finally the Hindu comes to the conclusion: "He who knows I would like to think, he is the Self; the soul is his divine eye." Here "thinking" means "inward perception, self-knowledge." In acts of self-knowledge our ego confronts itself, as it were, or as the Veda expresses it, the spirit is embraced by a knowing Self as by a loving woman. Narcism is the natural and necessary prerequisite to self-knowledge. But in animism this psychic constellation is at the basis of *every* cognition.

To understand animism and its narcissistic basis it is advisable to submit the Vedic ideas of the "origin of the world out of Atman" to a more intimate analysis: In *Brihadaranyaka-Upanishad* I, 4, 1, we read:

"In the beginning this world was only Atman, shaped like a human being. He looked about him, and he saw nothing but himself. So he called out to the beginning: 'This is I!' This was the origin of the name I. . . .

Then he was afraid; that is why one is afraid when one is alone. And then he thought: "Why should I be afraid, seeing that there is nothing but I?" This made his fear to vanish; for, what should he have been afraid of? For one is afraid only of another.

But neither did he have any pleasure; therefore one has no pleasure when one is alone. So he had a desire for another. For he was as large as a woman and a man when they hold each other in embrace. This self of his he cleft in two parts; from this there resulted husband and wife. Therefore is this body only a moiety of the self. . . . Therefore is this empty space here filled up by the woman. He mated with her; therefrom resulted mankind.

But she protested: "How may he mate with me, seeing that he begat me out of himself? Well, then! I will conceal myself!" Therewith she became a cow; but he became a bull and mated with her. Therefrom resulted bovine animals. Then she became a mare; but he became a stallion; she became an ass, and he became an ass and mated with her. This was the

origin of the single-hoofed animals. She became a goat, he became a buck; she a ewe, he a ram, and he mated with her; from this there originated goats and sheep. And thus it happened that he created everything that couples, down to the ants.

Then he acknowledged: "Verily, I myself am creation, for I have created this whole world!" (*Die Geheimlehre d. Veda*, p. 22.)

Primitive man is narcissistic; he sees everywhere only himself. "He was as big as a woman and a man when they are in each other's embrace." From a splitting up of this bi-sexual primitive man arose the sexes. Originally the other sex was contained in Atman himself; it is only his double, his reflection.

We shall quote here a parallel from Egyptian mythology:

"In the beginning was Nu . . . he is 'the only one, the truly existent, the only really living one, the sole begetter in the heavens and on the earth who was not created, the father of fathers, the mother of mothers.' . . . He does not need to step out of himself to become fruitful; he finds within his own lap the material for continual procreation. In himself, in the overflow of his being, he conceives his fruit, and since to him there is no difference between conception and birth he brings forth within himself since all eternity a second self." (G. Maspero, *Geschichte d. morgenländ. Völker im Altertum*, Leipzig, 1877, p. 26 f.)

In a sacred text the (Egyptian) God Chepra says:

"I am he who am my own mate with my fist,
In that I pollute myself with my shadow."
Thus spake I with my mouth, I myself.
The ejection became the god Schu
And the outflow the goddess Tafnut.

.

Schu and Tafnut created the deities Qeb and Nut,
Qeb and Nut created the deities Osiris, Horus, Set,
Isis and Nephitis, out of the body.
One after the other of them.

Their children are numerous on this earth."

(H. Brugsch, *Relig. u. Mythol. d. alt. Egypten*, 1888, p. 740 f.)

The narcissist does not need to step out of himself to be fruitful: the sovereign and omnipotent self proclaims himself the creator of the world.

Narcism, we said, lies between the periods of (pure) auto-eroticism and object-eroticism; it is only a transitional stage,

therefore a plastic state, and often shows a decided tendency to pass over into the next phase. We see this in the primitive human being of the Veda: he is afraid to be alone, he has no further joy in his solitariness; he longs for a companion.

A variant of the Vedic account of the creation says (*Maitrayana-Upanishad*, 2, 6):

"Prajapâti, verily, existed alone in the beginning. He had no joy, because he was alone. By directing his thoughts on himself he created the numerous creatures. He saw these standing there unconscious and lifeless as a stone, and motionless as a tree-trunk. And he determined: I shall enter into them and thus awake them to consciousness." (*Die Geheimlehre d. Veda*, p. 194.)

The creation of the world is only the self-cognition of Atman. Reality comes into existence when I think it; it is only a projection of my Self, a revelation or envisagement of the inner state of the omnipotent ego. Here Prajapâti appears as the Atman (the soul) of the world (as the universal Atman): the universe is thought of on the analogy of mankind.

The animist projects his own thoughts into a seeming reality wherein they behave like veritable realities. The animist *believes* in his spirits and gods and thereby creates a world *based on his experiences*, a world in whose presence he is powerless. Let us cite a few illustrations: "In Great-Bassan a piece of fetich-wood was laid on the abdomen of the defendant; his fear of what it might do was so great that he confessed his crime. Under the door-jamb of the palace of the King of Dahomay a fetich is concealed. If one of the wives of the King has been guilty of any wrong this fetich discovers the misfeasance if she crosses this threshold. The fear of the fetich exerts such tremendous power that the women are seized with abdominal cramps merely out of fear and voluntarily confess their sin." "No thief has the courage to break into a house that is guarded by a wooden fetich with a tall tuft of feathers or an empty pot on a fork-shaped stick." (F. Schultze, l. c., p. 226, 229.) The belief in the fetich, i. e., the firm conviction that a punitive spirit resides in the fetich, begets a peculiar experience: the guilty women experience genuine cramps and thereby the reality of the punitive spirit is confirmed.

In fact, the ancient custom of ordeals (God's judgment, trial by battle) was possible only by virtue of an animistic viewpoint. "The ordeal is . . . the decision of a (legal or non-legal)

dispute capable of judicial or even a moral judgment between two parties each of whom claimed right and truth on his side, the dispute being decided by the (natural or supernatural) intervention of God as an all-knowing witness and a wholly just judge (not as a punitive avenger), by means of an omen determined by the place and time of the occurrence. The ordeal takes place according to a procedure proposed by one of the contending parties and generally accepted as a valid procedure for this purpose, and is followed by the sentence of the worldly tribunal." (F. Dahn, *Studien z. Gesch. d. germ. Gottesurteile*, 1880, p. 13.) The "sacred morsel" was often regarded as appropriate material for the discovery of the unjust or guilty person. The accused or suspected person was required to eat a piece of bread upon which some magic formula had been inscribed; if he could not swallow it he was considered guilty of the wrong charged against him. "An evil conscience and the consciousness of guilt, on the one side, and, on the other side, faith and strong personalities invested with the halo of holiness and supernatural endowments, have tremendous power. It is the laws of suggestion and auto-suggestion that have imparted such a serious background to the peculiar practices of the ordeal, as that of the sacred morsel." (Ad. Jacobi, *Der Ursprung d. Judicium offae. Arch. f. Religionswiss.*, 13: 565.)

As long as one believes in a supernatural world, in the manifestations of demonic beings, there is no possibility of getting away from their imagined powers. For the belief in spirits begets phenomena as if the spirits were objective causes. To the believer an angry and punitive God is a reality and every disobedience is really punished by Him. So long as one has no doubts that supernatural powers exist (i. e., manifest themselves) they exist.

We are living in a time in which mankind takes a sober attitude to reality and in which most of us see no miracles and don't want to see any. A mystic of the nineteenth century says to this sobered humanity: "The materialists assert that a demonic world exists as little as their ability to get in touch with it by magic; it is difficult to conceive a greater error. The holy and the unholy are all about us; mankind may approach either one or the other and either of them will approach him if he attracts it to himself. Or mankind may maintain a middle ground, taking part neither in heaven nor in hell, and be devoted to the earth—and this is the attitude of the great majority of our contemporaries. If these upward or downward forces are not used for a long time, they seem to get lost or to be for-

gotten and denied." (M. Perty, *Die sichtbare u. d. unsichtbare Welt.*) We see, then, that the animistic viewpoint is not banished by experience, because it is itself a peculiar "experience."

Ultimately every world-philosophy depends upon assertions which cannot be further confirmed. The logical bond of cause and effect cannot be continued to infinity and must, therefore, have a point of departure (a beginning) which needs no further derivation. It would appear that the ultimate elements of knowledge are those which are furnished by the perceptions. But even a little reflection will show that the content of objective perception is inadequate to furnishing a philosophy.

To prove what I have just said I shall refer to some of our views concerning space. We know that through every point in space two straight lines can be drawn (which then delimit a plane). Space therefore, always contains straight lines which, lying in a plane, meet in a point (or have a point in common). But we may also ask ourselves whether in a given plane there may not be straight lines which will not meet in a common point under any circumstances? The current (Euclidian) geometry, which has prevailed for so long, answers this question affirmatively inasmuch as it operates with the conception of parallel lines which it defines as lines lying in one plane and never meeting, no matter how far they may be extended in either direction. But experience is in no position to say anything definite about this "never" inasmuch as experience is limited, finite. Even though according to our present views two parallel lines do not meet, it is not impossible that a considerable extension of the sphere of our experiences may discover that such lines may meet. When I assume that parallel lines exist, or if I deny this, I am venturing beyond the evidence of direct experience. All our maxims about parallel lines therefore embody a hypothetical factor that is beyond our senses. In more recent times attempts have been made (Helmholtz, Riemann) to build up logical geometrical systems that would be complete within themselves and independent of the assumption of parallel elements. In the construction of geometrical systems we must proceed from premises which cannot be decided on logical grounds or by our views of space. But if we look at the matter from the historical viewpoint, we are confronted by the fact that of the many conceivable systems of geometry up to the present only one has been accepted by mankind: the Euclidean system with which we are all familiar from our school-days and which postulates parallel lines. And thereto we must note the remarkable circumstance that the mass of mathematicians have not yet be-

come aware of the (hypothetical) nature of their postulate: it was simply impossible for them to think differently. One is therefore justified in saying that the postulation of parallel lines is really the intellectual expression of a definite instinct. Knowledge is dependent not only on the objective nature of the knowable data but, at the same time, on the peculiar nature of the knowing subject.

It follows from the above that if the nature of a knowing subject differs essentially from ours, the bases of his knowledge must look quite different. The world must appear very different to the genuine narcissist than to the non-narcissist.

It also follows that the supernatural does not constitute the essence of animism, inasmuch as supersensory factors necessarily must enter into all knowledge. The theoretical elaboration of the data gained by experience must reach out beyond these if we would not be placed in a situation in which we should have continually to alter our fundamental principles with each new step in the extension of our experiences. The specific element in the narcissist is his placing himself in the world and then identifying this with himself. From this results the tendency to have terrestrial occurrences proceed in accordance with the pattern of personal motives. With the fading out of the narcissistic attitude the (supernaturally) acting personages are gradually transformed into operative forces, and in the place of animism we have a naturalistic world-philosophy.

(Translated by S. A. T.)

NOTES.

¹ "We have our five senses and we have before us the world as it is and vouched for by the evidence of our senses. The question is how we get to the concept of another world."—Max Müller, *Vorlesungen üb. d. Urspr. u. Entw. d. Religion* (*The Origin and Evolution of Religion*), Strassb., 1880, p. 197.

² Max Müller, *Natürliche Religion* (*Natural Religion*), Leipzig, 1890, p. 162. "In the luminous sky they (the old Hindus) behold an illuminator (Dyaus); in the all-enveloping heavens a concealer (Varuna); in the noise of the thunder and in the fury of the lightning they feel the presence of a grumbler (Rudra) and a mad ruffian (Marutas); and out of the rain they make a rainer (Indra). Id., *Origin of Rel.*, p. 343.

³ "The animist peoples all places with spirits as provocative causes which (spirits) are, in general, invisible beings which can become manifest only under special conditions."—Fr. Schultze, *Psychol. d. Naturvölker*, Leipzig, 1900, p. 312.

⁴ "Animism really consists in this, that a part of our experience, understanding of all the other parts of our experience." (H. Hofding, namely, our experience of the psychic life, is made the basis of our *Der menschl. Gedanke* (*Human Thought*), Leipzig, 1911, p. 127.

PSYCHO-ANALYSIS AND PEDAGOGY

By DR. ALFONSO MAEDER, Zürich.

Modern medicine is dominated by a tendency to respect natural processes as much as possible. There is a growing confidence in spontaneous cures; in many cases the physician contents himself with creating the conditions favorable to the natural tendency to a cure, with giving nature a chance and not interfering with it. Psychiatry and neurology, following the examples of surgery and internal medicine, have begun to pursue the same course. The influence of psycho-analysis tends in the same direction. Pedagogy offers us an exact parallel: the pupil, and not the curriculum, now occupies the teacher's interest; the laws of the child's evolution are becoming the true guides for the educator. The pioneer of pedagogy actually expressed this in the formula: "create favorable conditions for the development of the child's natural powers." Psycho-analysis enables us to look deeper into the mechanisms of the child's normal development and inhibitions. In this essay I shall discuss two questions which psycho-analysis seems competent to illuminate.

I. The significance of the relations between teacher and pupil.

Classical pedagogy had a somewhat mechanistic conception of the relations between teacher and pupil, somewhat comparable to the transmitting and receiving stations of a telephone. Modern pedagogy looks at the matter from the viewpoint that teaching is a matter involving living human beings who exert influence on each other. Psycho-analysis has brought about an essentially profounder understanding of these relations—and it is of this alone that we shall speak. It has established the fact

that two powerful spheres of influence are involved: the influence of the teacher's Unconscious on the pupil and the pupil's Unconscious on the teacher. Analysts have been put on the track of these phenomena by the study of pathological cases which so frequently caricature normal processes.

A.—*The Pupils and Their Influence on the Teacher:*

In this section I shall deal mainly with the negative aspect of the subject as it appears in the physician's material. We speak of a pupil's "negative complex" if he shows the tendency to react chiefly with refusal, denial or opposition to suggestions and requirements. Comprehensibly enough, this negative complex manifests itself at school only indirectly, e. g., by passive resistance, purposeful mistakes, frequent forgettings, or marked dullness, etc. We have learned to trace this attitude back to the unfavorable influence exerted by one or other parent during the child's earliest years: hardness, indiscriminating strictness, injustice, abuse, and even a spirit of opposition in the parents themselves may be among the important factors. In most cases it is, as might be expected, the father who has been at fault. In our psycho-analytic terminology we say that the child has a "negative father transference." The child develops a negative attitude towards all persons whom it identifies "unconsciously" with its father; it carries this about somewhat like colored spectacles which make it see the whole outer world as having only one color. Such a child, owing to a recurring negative transference (which is wholly unconscious and wholly automatic), repudiates all persons who appear to it as its father or resemble him externally, and especially if they make *demands* on it or assume an air of *authority*. The teacher is repudiated because of subjective, unconscious causes: he is looked upon as the child's "opponent." Owing to this peculiar process (which operates in all quietness), the relations between teacher and pupil suffer greatly; for not only the teacher, but the subject he teaches, is repudiated. The youngster does not understand; sometimes he gives the impression that he does not wish to understand; then there is punishment, scolding, etc.; old domestic scenes seem to be revived, etc. It can be easily proved from a study of some patients that the rejection of certain subjects, e. g., mathematics, because of such an identification, has gradually given rise to the legend that this particular individual has no talent or gift for the subject in question.

If psycho-analysis is invoked early enough a normal relationship may be established and the child's talents will not be in-

terfered with. As we see, the matter of judging a child's talents needs revision. In the future, when discussing the subject of talent, we shall have to consider two factors, exactly as in the study of inferiority, to wit: *a static factor* (disposition) and *a functional factor*. An example: a boy of 17 is backward in mathematics and makes no progress in linguistics. His neurotic father had always laid great stress on these particular subjects; as the years went by, the youngster developed a fearful spite which had a tremendous influence on him and inhibited the gifted lad's talent, as subsequent investigation proved; in the natural sciences and technology, on the other hand, subjects which he associates with his beloved mother, he does more than is required of him and greatly excels other children of his age. Only by a laborious conquest of the negative transference by means of psycho-analytic treatment was it possible to bring out the utilization of his natural gifts in behalf of the neglected subjects. This process of transferring an emotional attitude from one object upon another is known in psychology as "*irradiation*."

This negative complex has not only a great *individual* significance but also a *social* significance, inasmuch as it tends to infect or intensify the negative complex of other pupils. Once the nucleus of such elements is formed in a class there is great danger of that class being disorganized. The teacher too becomes irritable, he gets excited, loses self-control easily, becomes discouraged and loses his authority, neglects his work, for he is helpless against the coalition. Some teachers permit themselves to become terrorized: before his final examinations a boy went to his chemistry teacher and asked to be examined on table salt. "If not," he said to the teacher, "he would bring disgrace not only on himself but on him." His impudence succeeded! The same boy knew how to make himself bleed at the nose at will, and took advantage of this trick whenever he was unprepared in any subject. His trick was discovered. It is easy to imagine what effect such things have on the feeling of authority in the other pupils. The pupil *studies* the teacher from all angles and soon finds his weak spots; he takes advantage of these as a means of amusing himself and to triumph over the person in authority, especially if the youngster has a negative father complex. He is driven to reproduce the family attitude to recreate the domestic drama everywhere (as we all do, unconsciously); he compels bad treatment on the part of the teacher, such as that of the father (one sometimes hears it said of a youngster that "he really wants to be treated badly"). As

soon as he succeeds in this he has once again confirmed his life's experience and thereby again lost a quantity of *confidence*; with each repetition he is driven more deeply into the negative. Without wishing it, his teacher has done him harm.

B.—The Teacher's Unconscious Influence on the Pupil:

Freud has given us the following formula: the psycho-analyst leads his patient only as far as he himself has gone. This means not only that he must know a lot about analysis but that he must also have been thoroughly analyzed. One's complexes make one blind. This applies, of course, also to the teacher. We shall hereafter demand, as is easily enough intelligible, that teachers shall have not only a thorough education and training but that they shall also be free persons, for only a free teacher can develop free pupils. A teacher who is himself equipped with a strong negative complex cultivates that complex in his pupils. In everyday speech we say that he does not get his pupils' sympathy. One of my patients, a head-teacher, is known for the strict discipline maintained in his school; he had succeeded in taming a particularly trying class. A bad neurosis brought him to me. Psycho-analysis brought out, among other things, that in his classroom he regularly indulged in two common types of fantasy: in one he thought of himself as an animal tamer who had been assigned to tame a pack of wild beasts; in the other he was a general who had to fight a whole army of enemies. His dreams were just as brutal (battles, boxing, etc.). He had always longed to be a soldier; obstacles of all sorts had been put in his path. He could not renounce this wish wholly, and so he created a fantasy world for himself in which his wishes were gratified. The above fantasies belong to a great cycle which had gradually consumed a part of his mental activities. It is easy to imagine what an unfavorable impression such an attitude is bound to have on the pupils.

A wholly different bond, I shall show later, should unite educators and children to one another. I had under treatment the head of a school, a very fine and talented man, who wrought great havoc on his environment with his strong negative complex; his great gifts were very largely wasted because of his internal conflicts.

Teachers should be required to be free individuals, i. e., free from psychic dissociations, and should have strong self-control. This has been for a long time demanded from modern teachers. (A school should be more than a place of instruction; it should

be an organ for true education.) Psycho-analysis gives us the true explanation for these empirical demands.

II. *The Utilization of Positive Transference.* (Organization of the Father-libido.)

In what has preceded we have become acquainted with one of the main obstacles to education, the so-called negative complex and its usual cause: a negative father-transference. (As to the treatment of this complex we shall say nothing now.) Our purpose now is to consider a more positive aspect of the educational problem. This is the more interesting because a goodly portion of actual pedagogues are in a state of uncertainty, one may confidently say in a state of error. All clear thinkers have recognized the fact that compulsion, great restriction of freedom of motion, routine, are dangerous. The new watchword became: Freedom for the child, respect for the child's individuality. No more compulsion, no more demands! The child will want the right thing of its own accord! Many of our so-called modern schools (free schools, private schools, etc.) cherish this principle, and many of the public schools of America acknowledge this basic idea. Commands are avoided; the child's sense of responsibility is relied upon. I consider this view-point one-sided, I may add, dangerously one-sided; I say this because of the very easily demonstrable consequences. It is an exaggerated reaction against compulsion and absolutism. To many children full freedom means dilettantism, the beginning of arbitrariness, slovenliness, laziness. To understand the full significance of this, one must know such children, must have treated them psycho-analytically. The feeling of responsibility is unquestionably present in every child, but it has to be practised, developed, ere it can become fully effective. It is an error to confound the disposition to this feeling with the complicated reactions of a socially ripe individual.

The normal evolution of a child must have guidance. We are loyal to the fundamental principle of pedagogy which demands consideration for the child's natural evolution when we demand a guide for the child. As we shall show, psycho-analysis has furnished proof of this.

The biological meaning of childhood has become known in our time. Childhood is a preparation for mature adulthood. As the organization of the nervous system in the animal kingdom becomes more complicated the necessary period of preparation (infancy) gets longer and longer. Man is at the apex of this

series. Civilization has greatly prolonged this preparatory phase. Man is not ripe for the management of the complicated tasks of civilized life when he becomes sexually ripe (puberty.) Our children are still dependent upon their parents and educators. Education provides the child with experience; it puts at its disposal the treasure of knowledge; it teaches it what is equally essential: how to react in a given situation; in other words, it teaches it the art of adaptation, the true measure of social value. The principle of total freedom in education, which we have criticised above, probably owes its origin to scientific observations. With but few exceptions, animals develop almost by themselves, out of themselves, by virtue of the significant play-impulses.

But one is not warranted in transferring to the human race this observation. The lion has led the same life for thousands of years; it hunts, devours, drinks and sleeps; its play in the first years of its life serves perfectly as practise in the art of catching its prey. Civilized man has wholly different tasks. His activity is a relatively recent acquirement, and is terribly complicated; in comparison with it the instinctive behavior of the lion, for example, is poor indeed. Play is no longer sufficient as adequate training. Guidance has become necessary. Without guidance the child is helpless in the presence of an obstacle; it withdraws from it.*

Psycho-analysis has revealed to us a so-called father-complex. We have already evaluated the negative aspect of this matter. What is the significance of its positive aspect?

A child watches its father, it wants to be as big, as strong, as influential, as intelligent as he; it wants to do what he does, The child chooses its own guide. In the course of time the

*Joyner, a well-known teacher in Boston, in a lecture before thousands of teachers, reproached the American schools with mollicoddling. I shall quote the passage *in extenso*. "Pardon me for designating as an altogether too common mistake committed in many of our best American schools, to make the path too easy for our children, in constantly leading them in the direction of least resistance, in helping them too much, in explaining much too much, even in doing altogether too much work ourselves to spare them some work. Isn't there a danger that by this 'battered bread and honey' method, we shall harm our children mentally, impair their souls, weaken their will-power, make their characters anemic, cripple their ability to think, and teach them to do not what is good but what pleases them? Should not children be brought up to do what is good and what duty commands, and to take an interest in these things, and to find a real pleasure in work even where at first they are confronted with unpleasant tasks?"

pattern changes. After the father come father substitutes which in the normal course of events constitute a progressive series. A typical list is as follows: the father, a teacher or minister, an old friend, a popular hero, a great man, the king, a national hero, a great writer or artist, later on God or a Higher Principle. This describes the development of the child's (especially the boy's) ideals. (Inquiries in the schools of various countries have given results which exactly parallel our psycho-analytic findings.) The original father concept is enlarged gradually and differentiated; it develops from the concrete to the abstract, from the personal to the objective; it becomes depersonalized and becomes the origin of such concepts as authority, power, masculinity, hero, God.

Owing to its peculiar development, psycho-analysis has put the main emphasis hitherto on the pathological, and in the matter of the father-complex it has stressed the disturbed development consequent upon the fixation of the paternal bond, i. e., the negative transference. In its investigation of abnormal cases attention was paid to the common element in the series of father substitutes. I attach great significance to the fact that *the differences*, and especially *the progression* in the choice of prototypes from the corporeal father to the highest *ideals* are recognized. This natural urge, this need of the child for guidance, this normal positive father transference must be utilized by the educator as a *power*; it is a lever with which many difficulties may be removed. The teacher must be acquainted with these natural forces and know how to guide them properly. Thanks to this inner impulse, the child can exert itself, put forth effort, to accomplish something; it expects and deserves *recognition* for what it achieves; between the child and its teacher there should be an exchange of emotions: effort deserves recognition, just as love begets counter-love. In his excellent work on psychology James says: "If we wanted to really punish someone, we could not devise anything worse, if such a thing were physically possible, than to let him run about free in the community without having anyone pay the slightest attention to him." We had an opportunity in recent times to see a pitiful illustration of this factor in all its powerful significance—I say pitiful because it concerns the recognition of a negativist (the bearer of a pre-eminently negative complex). While his residence was being stormed, the anarchist wrote in his testament that he had won the admiration of many on the globe by his courage; the newspapers had made his portrait known thruout

the world. The child seeks recognition from its prototype; that is why parents and educators must try to set a really good example, for children possess an amazing faculty of judging their authorities, as I have already remarked. In corroboration of this I quote herewith a sentence from the biography of the great writer Strindberg, a sentence which contains, as my experience has convinced me, something absolutely universal and typical: "having been an extremely impressionable and therefore timid child, he suffered quite early from the injustice and the non-understanding of his environment at home and at school. He was easily imposed upon, sought the protection of those who were stronger (whom, owing to a congenital tendency, he worshipped as *higher beings*); and for all that, owing to his analytical intellect, his gods could not endure, and he had to be constantly seeking out more differentiated gods whom he could reproach when they disappointed him, and so on indefinitely." In a higher stage of development, in which the prototype has evolved into an impersonal, genuine ideal, recognition no longer comes from without but from within, from that faculty which we call *conscience*. Guidance in the above sense has ceased.

So that we are really complying with an *inner requirement* when we give the child the proper *guidance*. We are thereby loyal to an acknowledged principle of modern pedagogy: education must proceed from within, not from without; it does not consist in the teacher's influence on the child but in the child's own activity, in activity following internal impulses. The educator must know these impulses and facilitate their manifestation by creating favorable conditions. (Claparede's formula.) The fanatical advocates of freedom, of whom I have spoken above, are in error; for the child's natural development its needs for guidance must be taken into consideration.

To avoid misunderstanding, I shall once again formulate the teacher's attitude to the child: he is not a potentate who controls the child and exercises an external compulsion, but the representative of those higher elements residing in the child and in accordance with which the child wishes to go. He is the guide that is sought by the child, a necessary guide through the numerous difficulties offered by its development.*

*From a review by Captain Fastrez ("La role des liens affectifs dans la coordination militaire." [The role of affective bonds in military co-operation.] Bulletin mensuel de l'Institut de Sociologie, Brussels, Nov., 1910). I borrow the following lines from the French officer Vaillant who thus describes the relationship between officers and soldiers:

JOURNAL OF SEXOLOGY AND PSYCHANALYSIS

In psycho-analytic treatment we have a relationship which may be compared with the above. The patient is in the toils of a state of dependence from which he has to be freed, out of which the physician gradually extricates him. For a long time he needs *guidance*; the analyst must assume the role of guide. I am no longer of the opinion that the physician should not advise his patient and should avoid influencing him. I must state emphatically that the period of personal guidance is of

"In addition to purely technical reasons, there are numerous social causes which give the soldier great importance on the field of battle. Tactics ought to be individualistic and provide for the employment of personal initiative seconded by intelligence and scorn of exertion and danger. But personal endeavor is worth nothing unless it is in co-operation with the actions of the rest. ... Each should feel that he needs his comrades. The work of one soldier is of no avail unless the others are working also. ... For a group to advance each individual soldier must wish to advance. Since every movement is perilous each consents to risk danger so that all may move forward, but he is willing to do that only if he is sure that all are doing the same. ... On the field of battle the soldiers must be devoted to and have confidence in one another; if a soldier, advancing into a rain of bullets, knows that his neighbor is with him, if he feels that in the perils of the fight he will not be abandoned by his comrades, he will submit to the promptings of his duty, which do not permit him to do less than the others, and throwing himself into the *mêlée*, he will dare to venture against the greatest dangers. ... I repeat it, there can be no organized fighting unless there is among the men voluntary devotion, readiness for self-sacrifice, and self-abnegation in the interests of all. Devotion here impels confidence and affection—affection for officers and for comrades. ... Thus affection appears as one of the most powerful stimulants in action. ... The only basis of discipline on the battle-field is the superiority of the officer, and this superiority is based on confidence and affection. ... Our superiority will not be real, efficient, or effectual till it is no longer imposed but recognized. Confident in our worth let us get down from the temporary pedestal of cardboard to which the officer is raised. In the hearts of our men we shall find one of granite. ... We are men, imperfect beings, the good will hide our faults. To be a good soldier a man does not need a skilled leader so much as a kind one. In a campaign it is our business to have men follow us in spite of hunger, weariness, and deadly danger. If we have that single quality, kindness, they *will* follow us. It is not a question of weakness or indulgence—passive kindness; but of active kindness; kindness which seeks pain to soothe it, misery to relieve it, and grief to comfort it. We must look after our men as a father watches a cradle. Without ever growing weary we must seek for and find shadows in the minds of our soldiers and then dispel them. ... From the highest to the lowest we are comrades; comrades through our common love of country, devotion to her defense, and the joyfully assumed sacrifice of our moral and physical powers to her barracks and of our lives to her battles.

variable duration and depends on the degree of the patient's maturity as far as regression is concerned. The guiding role of the physician does not consist simply in taking a place in the series of father surrogates and playing the role of a stereotyped father, but rather in facilitating *the development of the primary father imago into an individual ideal* (the ideal which would have been possible for the individual in question if he had not been interfered with by an infantile fixation). Herein I have indicated one aspect of the important process designated as *sublimation*. To guard against misunderstanding, I want to emphasize at once that the physician must guard against (consciously or unconsciously) instilling into the patient his own philosophy, his own ideals. The processes of evolution and liberation must go on in the patient's soul. The physician represents only, but firmly and unequivocally, what he has discovered in the subject's strivings, and continues to do so until the patient sees it with his own eyes and grasps it emotionally. The analyst represents really the *demands* of the healthy portion of the invalid; he impersonates, as it were, these demands. The most important step towards overcoming this transference is brought about when the patient's positive transference upon the analyst is directed upon the patient's ideal strivings; the absolute confidence in the physician is gradually transformed into genuine *self-confidence*. During his treatment, and for a long time subsequently, the neurotic has to make up for what he has lost in his invalidism or to compensate for what disease has stunted in his development. The French expression "re-education" is appropriate here and expressive of the relationship to the theme of my essay.

At present psycho-analysis seems to me to offer basic data towards the solution of two important questions in pedagogy: the psycho-analytic viewpoint gives us the explanation for the true relations between teacher and child, and it also reveals to us an important aspect of the psychic evolution of the child and its natural requirements—knowledge which gives us guiding lines for the science of education.

(Translated by S. A. Tannenbaum.)

A CASE OF PARANOID HYSTERIA

By S. A. Tannenbaum, M. D., New York.

To scientific psychotherapeutics a detailed case report is what a specimen is to the botanist or entomologist. If a report is incomplete it is as valueless, from a scientific standpoint, as an incomplete and mangled specimen of an unknown species would be. As a matter of fact, owing to the imperfect state of our knowledge of the psyche and from other considerations, such a report is more than worthless inasmuch as the investigator has no means of supplementing his data, has no means of checking up the accuracy and veracity of the reporter and may become the victim of the suggestions of the therapist reporting the case.

The modern treatment of a psychoneurosis usually consists of a long drawn-out study of the patient's mental and emotional life. During such a study a vast abundance of material is poured out before the therapist and it necessarily devolves upon him, in reporting such a case, to select his material. In doing this, he is sure to be influenced not only by considerations of discretion and space and time but also by what he wants to prove. In this there lies, of course, a great danger; he is more than likely to select for publication only such material as fits in with his theory and to make no mention of facts which do not fit in with it. That this is a very bad thing for psychotherapeutics and for psychology must be apparent.

In reporting the following case, I shall follow the method I adopted in reporting the case of Mrs. A. ("A Case of Hysteria with Facial Paresthesia") in the pages of *Psyche and Eros* (1921, vol. II, Nos. 2, 3 and 4). I shall follow my note-book faithfully and report all that the patient said and exactly as

she said it, using her own language, and omitting only such details from her daily life as are of absolutely no importance, e.g., her trips to the dressmaker, the grocer, the butcher, etc., the domestic affairs of her relatives, details of her management of her business, etc. Her story will be in quotation marks, and my comments and questions will be enclosed in square brackets. The reader will understand that blanks indicate omissions for the purpose of preserving the patient's anonymity. I consider it more desirable to do this than to misrepresent those facts, even though this involves some risk.

Mrs. B. appeared in my office some twelve months ago. She is a tall, strong, robust, striking-looking woman, well and neatly dressed, and looks distressed and haggard. In reply to direct questions she says that her name is, is married fifteen years, has no children, is living with her husband at, in, in a four room apartment, keeps no maid, does all the housework herself, is forty-one years old, was born in one of the western States, has lived in various parts of the country, has no religion, her parents were non-religious Catholics, her husband is a non-religious Jew. She was graduated from public school and went to high school for three years. Ever since leaving school she worked as a, which is also her husband's present occupation. She had appendicitis in her childhood but was cured without an operation; also had measles, scarlatina, pertussis and, possibly, diphtheria. She began to menstruate between the ages of fifteen and sixteen, profusely and painfully, lasting eight days; menses of long duration even now, but painless and regular; very slight leucorrhoea. Her father died suddenly seven or eight years ago at an advanced age. Her mother is living, seventy years old, and is "melancholy,—she is one of my troubles." She had two brothers, both a few years younger than herself; the younger one died three years ago and the older one four years ago. She is above the average in height and weight; a remarkable looking woman and smartly dressed; her hair brown and bobbed. Patient was sent to me by a friend of hers and knows absolutely nothing about psychoanalysis. Externally she presents no evidence of disease. Having obtained the above facts, I ask the patient to tell me her "story" as fully as she can. She bursts into tears and narrates:

"Physically there is nothing the matter with me though I've lost 35 pounds within a few weeks, but *I am afraid I am losing my mind*; I am *troubled with fear all the time*; for years I have feared losing my mind. You see, *my family history is*

very bad. My mother was always very peculiar; once she didn't speak to my father for seven years though they lived under the same roof; they quarrelled terribly and finally separated. Mother always managed to conceal her domestic troubles from the neighbors. My unhappiness began with all this unhappiness in our home. When mother lost her periods she became melancholy, took to her bed and stayed there for months and wasted away till she was reduced almost to a skeleton. All this time she was very religious and full of remorse but took no interest in anything. Finally she was taken away to an insane asylum where she recovered after a few weeks. She used to harp incessantly on father having failed to keep his promise to her not to smoke; she kept harping on that and quarrelling with him and refusing to sit at table with him. Away from home she was 'an angel of mercy'—that's what the neighbors called her; for years she had acted as practical nurse to friends and neighbors without any thought of remuneration.

"She was very mean and abusive and treated us all like dogs. [Weeps.] She was a dual personality; she had two voices, one for home and one for the neighbors. She always ridiculed me for my height; nothing I ever did pleased her; she never gave her children credit for any brains and pooh-poohed everything we said. Finally, at the age of twenty-two, I left home. Half a year later my father sued her for divorce and got it on the ground of incompatibility. Just before this my youngest brother began to act unnaturally; he began to sleep a lot, to act strange, and became violently insane; he was elated, had grandiose ideas, said he was the partner of Jesus. He was committed to an asylum and stayed there a year and a half. When he came out mother refused to keep him and sent him to my father who was living in a hotel. In a month my brother had a relapse, was re-committed and died in the asylum. I saw my mother once after that, after my marriage, when she visited me for about a week out West where my husband and I lived for about two and a half years. After we moved East she also visited me once for four or five days but she got very quarrelsome and tried to make trouble between me and my husband. Just before my brother's death I had paid my mother a visit at her request but she was so quarrelsome that I had to leave her. After brother's death she was melancholic; she also showed great grief when my father died.

"My younger brother kept writing me discouraging letters about mother. Her illness and his worry about the possibility of being called into military service made him sick and he sent for me. When I got to him he was dead,—he had committed suicide. [Weeps.] He had been a very bright boy and had a wonderful mind; a letter which he had left for me was full of his troubles with mother. He had shot himself in the temple with a borrowed rifle as he sat on the porch. He used to worship mother and plead with her to brace up and be well. She had been taken to an asylum a few days before he killed himself. She has been living with me for the past three years,

during the first half of which she was always in bed, with her head completely covered. She is always hostile to me; now she is up and about but very frail and refuses to go out. For a few weeks I had her in a private sanitarium two years ago, but it cost so much that I had to take her out. I can't bear the thought of a state institution. Besides, her talk is very rational.

["How do you get on with your husband?"] We get on as well as the average; he is a Jew, over fifty years of age, a manufacturer of trimmings. I am his second wife. He has no children from his first wife, nor from me. I am *always fearful* and am *always thinking of suicide*. I am ashamed to say these things; even while I am at a movie or elsewhere I'll suddenly say, even aloud, "I'll kill myself!" I do that many times a day and even while I'm home alone. And I keep touching my right temple,—that's the spot where my brother shot himself. His death had made a profound impression on me.

"Everything seems to be wrong; *I don't seem to fit*; I don't please anybody. [Weeps.] I spend my time reading. Yesterday I was very *unhappy*, my eyes looked wild and my face was drawn and I *imagine that people see my disturbed state of mind*. I think I'm *partly insane* and must hide it, and consequently I think a lot about what I say, so that I won't say what will sound queer. *I'm afraid to be thought peculiar*.

"Most of the time I am *very restless*. Sometimes I awake in the morning feeling fine; my head is clear, I'm ambitious and keep my house immaculate, almost 'surgically clean,' as a doctor told me recently. Other mornings I can't do a thing, *can't concentrate and do not even take care of myself*. Usually I'm *very fussy about myself*. At times I'm *afraid to be alone*; at times *to be with people*. At such times I go to the stores or to a theatre where I won't be likely to meet friends or be known. I dislike housework and therefore used to assist my husband in his business. I work on my nerves all the time. At times I awake with a *cloudy feeling* and very restless. I am very *impulsive*; I get a sudden urge to do something, I do it and then think I was crazy. Something makes me do things *foreign to my nature*. I *feel dreadfully inferior* and haven't the pride I ought to have. I can never appear at my best.

[At this point I assure Mrs. B. that I do not consider her insane or in any danger of becoming so; tell her that she is evidently suffering from a psycho-neurosis which can be cured, and that I shall require her to visit me not less than three times a week on alternate days and pay me dollars per session.] "I won't dare tell my husband the kind of treatment I'm getting; he won't understand it. I can't afford to spend much on myself but I must try to help myself. I have a few hundred dollars and I'll use some of that.

[*Second Session.*] "This is one of the mornings when I'm feeling better. Do you object if I smoke? ["No."] I wonder if you can help me; I must have some hope or I would not be here. There was something on my mind but I've forgotten it. Smoking soothes me; is it injurious? ["No."] At first

I smoked only to be doing something; now I miss it and take it as a glass of milk or a piece of candy; I never smoke in public and even at home I have to do it on the sly because my mother objects to it just as she did to my father's smoking. My husband doesn't object, but I would not like the neighbors to find it out. *I wish I could be more independent and self-reliant.* I'm *very sensitive to criticism*, am *always criticising myself and accusing myself*. Is my age responsible for it? ["No."] Are you sure smoking is not injurious? ["Quite sure."] It's not a pretty habit. When we lived in the hotel, from five to three years ago, I was in the *habit of taking a cocktail* every night and it made me strong, brave, self-reliant, and I was a different person. At times I took a little sherry or whiskey during the day; then I felt more at ease and could talk better.

"*I think I must go insane some day because it's in the family.* My aunt warned me against the change of life. [I assure her that she has nothing to fear from the menopause or from heredity at her age.] But isn't a woman more sensitive at this age? ["No."] If a woman begins to menstruate late will she get her menopause early? ["Not necessarily."] I'm muddled on my dates.

"I was restless yesterday and couldn't stick to anything I tried to do, to read or to sew; so I went from place to place. I haven't found the right niche. I'm not lazy and *am very thorough* in everything I do. When I start anything I can't stop until I'm through with it. At times I shirk my work, omit things I should do, neglect business matters, and *procrastinate* from day to day. I know there must be something that I can do well.

"What is the voice that makes me say I'll kill myself? ["I can't explain that yet."] Sometimes I even *swear* at nobody in particular and get into a very ugly mood and say out loud, "goddam son-of-a!" My husband swears a lot of times; he is very nervous and excitable. His conversation is full of goddams and "what the h." His whole family swears. He swears on the slightest provocation. My *parents used to abuse each other awfully*; there were terrible scenes between them and that embittered me and made me lose faith in people. People who meet me like me at first; later on I feel that they don't like me—I imagine I see a change in them. I'm *super-sensitive*. I'm ashamed to confess what I'm going to say now: at times I *think people give each other strange looks and winks behind my back and at times I think I hear them saying things about me*. My husband's relatives accept me and think the world of me, he says, but they say things in Jewish or Polish in my presence which I don't understand and I think that they are criticising me. Recently I heard one of them say 'meshugane goya,' and I knew that she meant me; the words mean 'crazy gentile woman.' I'm trying to adapt myself to my Jewish family and not to mind such things, but this may aggravate my condition. I visit them about once a week because

I'm very fond of their children. Even when I'm in the stores I imagine people are saying things about me. If I think it's only imagination it worries me even more. If I feel that some person who ridicules me is in the street, I refrain from going out so as not to give him a chance to talk about me. I argue with myself that I ought to go out but I don't seem to be able to get the courage to do it. ["Go out in spite of yourself!"]

"I'm easily crushed. I *have a temper and get terribly mad*; but I don't react at once and then there is a turmoil within me and *fierce resentment*, and I could scratch their eyes out. I *indulge in fantasies of the terrible things I'll do to them*. I never think that people are talking about me if I am in a place where I'm not known. If I'm restless and *lonely* I go into the big stores to walk around or have a coffee. I often go to the movies but at times cannot get interested and am so shaky I have to go out. I can't bear comedies. Willie—that's my husband—finds the movies a great relaxation but he prefers a game of pinochle. His friends come to the house to play cards—that always means unhappiness to me, because I don't play and I have to be entertaining the women, and I get terribly bored. I *like games of chance*; love to play twenty-one and especially to shoot crap and to play the races. It's all because I *want excitement*, anything to take my mind off myself. I also *love to dance*, but I almost never dance now. When we lived in V..... I owned an automobile and got a great deal of comfort out of it; but it was stolen and I lost a lot of money on it. Driving a car made me calm and gave me a feeling of self-confidence; I never felt or looked better than at that time.

"I don't think I can go ahead with this treatment; I can't afford it. My husband won't understand it and won't give me the money for it. If I say anything about it to him he is sure to tell me to get interested in something or to go to a doctor to get a tonic. I think I won't mention the subject to him. ["You had better tell him all about it; secrets are not conducive to good results. Tell him you are in no need of a tonic and that you would gladly become interested in something if you could do so."]

[*Third Session.*] "I told Willie about my treatment and he scoffed at it, said he had no patience with that sort of thing, that I had too much time on my hands and that you must be a freak doctor or charlatan. He wanted to know if you are a licensed physician. Then I told him of my mental condition and he said it was only a whim of mine, but I insisted that I was ill, so he agreed to let me try this treatment for a week. Marriage certainly submerges a woman's individuality; men have no patience with sick wives. He thinks I ought to do something, perhaps church work—anything that doesn't pay. He won't let me take a job for fear people will think us poor; his pride would suffer if I earned money. Men want their women to feel dependent upon them. He suggested that smoking may be driving me crazy and that I ought to stop it. My life is all wrong and can't be straightened out.

"He is very skeptical about you. His whole family is skeptical about everything and everybody; everybody is a fool to them. I know I would feel much better if I could tell you everything I think. But I would feel terribly disloyal if I told you all I think about my husband as I have told you about my mother. Everything works to drive me mad. He is very erratic, noisy, loud-mouthed; when he is angry he yells so that I am ashamed for the neighbors, and consequently I keep quiet. He gets mad at trivial things and screams at the top of his voice. [Weeps throughout.] He never does anything I ask him to do and swears all the time. It's always 'goddam it!' or 'goddam the hell!' or 'what the hell!' etc. He addresses me as 'you devil!' and scolds me or is grouchy about everything; I am never anything but a 'goddam fool.' We quarrel about the most inconsequential things. [Gives illustrations which may be omitted.] He humiliates me everywhere, even in public. He acts like the lord and master of creation. He is the worst possible husband for one of my disposition. He is always full of life and pep, except when I want him to do something for me. Yet he says he thinks the world of me. He is very generous with me as far as money and clothes go; up to a year ago we lived expensively and I had beautiful clothes and jewelry. Then I used to feel well, except when he made a scene. He is a very restless man and has been meeting with business reverses of late; he has a great deal to worry him. [Goes into details about business which I omit.] When I saw how badly business was going and that he was losing his health about it, I offered to go to the office and help him out. He accepted my offer and I worked very hard in making purchases, making samples, etc., but in the end I advised him to give up that business and take his loss. At such times he leans on me and takes my advice and approves of me. He is in business again now but I don't go down to his office because he will humiliate me in the presence of his employees and would not hesitate to yell at me or call me a damnfool in the presence of anybody. His whole family is that way and very selfish; they are all very self-satisfied and critical of everybody; their conversation consists of nothing but personalities. They are an ignorant and uneducated lot.

"I wait on Willie hand and foot with his clothes, his bath, his food, etc. He always speaks explosively and is always censorious and fault-finding; his voice sounds like a hammer pounding me. Now I get only a small weekly allowance and therefore our home isn't what it was. I am very sensitive to colors and nice lines—and consequently *my home doesn't satisfy me*. He doesn't let me spend any money now, objects if I spend fifty cents on having my hair curled once a week, but he doesn't mind losing five dollars in pinochle—he says he needs the relaxation. Instead of taking me to the theatre, he takes me to his sister though it makes me sick. His family's small talk sickens me. [I omit details of this small talk.] I got one of

his sisters a job playing the piano in a movie theatre, so they call me 'the impresario.' They are a very ungrateful lot. These things hurt me and crush me. *No wonder I swear such a lot.* ["So, then, one mystery is solved!"]

"Last night my mother washed a few dishes and did a little work in the kitchen. It made me so happy that someone was doing something for me that I cried for joy. Willie said I made a laughing stock of myself to go to a doctor and tell him all about myself. His family would think me crazy. I once danced the fox trot in his sister's house and she wanted to know where I had learned that. Willie used to be jealous of my dancing tho he approved of it. We used to dance in the grill room of the hotel where we lived in V. . . . I used to dance with his friends but he found fault with me for it and said I talked too much to the men. His sister had the impudence to say I danced from 6 P. M. to 2 A. M., and she wanted to know what I was doing after midnight while waiting for Willie to finish his pin-ochle game in the card room. In her own home she had the impudence to tell me she thought me forty-eight years old when I was only thirty-eight! I refused to go there any more and Willie said I don't understand them and should make allowances for them. His family and I are worlds apart: they 'have no time' to read books or magazines; they think I'm 'queer' and speak of me as 'the lady of leisure.' I don't know what they would say if they knew I smoke; I do it only to be devilish.

[*Fourth Session, three days later.* The day before Mrs. B. had phoned that she was so much better and that it wasn't necessary for her to come again, but I insisted that she ought to continue her treatment if she wanted to be permanently cured.] "I'm feeling very much better and don't know what did it. [Smokes.] I have been feeling fine since my last talk with you. I was in doubt whether I should quit yesterday; that's why I phoned you. After I talked to you I was ashamed of myself. These talks help me; things now look different to me somehow and seem to straighten out; and my viewpoint on some things seems to be changing. I notice that people do like me and are calling on me since I'm feeling better. I'm convinced the fault is mine if they don't; I'm sure I have been putting up barriers between myself and them. [Mrs. B. dances in her chair and I call her attention to it.] I didn't know I was doing this; I must have been doing it unconsciously because I'm feeling better and happy. *The last two days I haven't heard any voices nor seen anybody making peculiar gestures.* Even Willie remarked that there is a great change in my looks and feelings. I can make him wilt easily: all I have to say is that I never cared for him anyhow, but I do that only if I feel fairly well—that squelches him. Two days ago I told him that his loud manner and his temper are responsible for my nervousness and he said he never means what he says. ["Did you accept that as an apology?"] Yes, but I don't forget a hurt quickly.

"I find it hard to talk to-day; I feel foolish sitting here. I ought to go into business—to get away from housework. Keep-

ing house gives me no sense of achievement; it doesn't pay for the amount of effort I put into it. Up to three years ago I was in business and was making a lot of money—that gave me not only financial independence, so that I could buy all sorts of things for myself that I can't get now, but also a sense of achievement. Willie is not stingy but he must be conservative now. I hate myself when washing dishes. The last few days even my mother seems brighter. Her deep melancholy, her moaning and sobbing, depressed me; because of her I couldn't leave the house. To spend my days as a cook and maid I consider a waste of life. In business I'd have a chance to talk to people. Willie's financial worries also depress me.

"My sister-in-law visited us last night, [etc.] Today I feel that my sisters-in-law like me, and so do their children, and they all make a fuss over me. The children in my neighborhood are fond of me [etc.]. Only adults disturb me; I don't think children ever think me queer. It's really only women whom I dislike and fear—they're catty. I avoid people because I don't like them. To-day it seems foolish to talk about these things. . . .

[After a long silence during which the patient was dancing in her chair and smoking happily I say to her: "Tell me about your sex life." At this she instantly becomes glum, averts her face and begins to bite her fingernails.] "I have nothing to say about that; no, I couldn't talk about that to-day—no, no. I know I haven't said anything about it. When I'm feeling well I can't get myself to be so frank as when I'm depressed; when I'm happy I'm reserved. No, I couldn't speak about my sexual life today. Perhaps I ought to come only when I'm not feeling well. [Smokes vigorously.] At home I don't smoke so much. Does your question about my sex life mean that you think I ought to be divorced? ["No; what puts the thought of divorce in your head?"] A few years ago I used to think of divorce and even spoke of it to Willie; when he heard of it he cried like a baby. Four years ago things were so bad that I decided to quit and completed plans for a divorce; that's out of the question now because of my mother's dependence on me. It's really for her sake that I have to go on living with him. Though I'm very unhappy, I'm also very sorry for him. *It's almost a fact that I don't love him* tho I would hate to admit that for I know he loves me. At times persons love us the more because we don't love them. Four years ago his temper and unreasonableness and jealousy made him unendurable. He accused me of flirting, of loving certain men in the hotel, and finally he forbade me to dance with them. If I was quiet or looked bored, he would say that I would be bright and lively if Mr. So-and-so were here, etc. I was having a good time those days for all that; I loved to associate with congenial people. [Patient stops speaking, sits lost in thought for a long time and shakes her head; refuses to say what she was thinking of. I ask her if she often indulges in day dreams.] I don't dream very much; I seldom recall my dreams. I don't believe in dreams. I'm

not religious; Willie is an agnostic; he is very intelligent and well read. He thinks psycho-analysis a fake, tho he knows nothing about it; he speaks of gullible women who have nothing to do but to waste their husband's money, but he said I could continue it if I had faith in it.

[*Fifth Session.* Ten minutes late.] "Is this treatment hypnotism? ["No."] I'm awfully afraid of suggestion—it gives me an uncanny feeling. I read about it in a copy of your magazine which I picked up in the waiting room a few days ago and it alarmed me. A few days ago I dreamt of a woman who had grown very tall and whose eyes were wide and staring; she took me by the neck and whirled me around in a circle and I felt she was trying to hypnotize me and I was helpless. This dream reminds me of an article on "woman's critical age" that I read in your magazine; I marked some passages which exactly apply to me. No, I won't discuss them now. For four years I used to be afraid of hypnotism; there was a certain person whose eyes I disliked—it was a man—it may have been imagination; at first I didn't fear him; before I tell you about him I must explain something. . . . I don't seem to be able to express myself to-day. [Shakes her head, averts her eyes and is very restless.] I know I'm wasting time and money. I could speak better if I knew that what I say is absolutely confidential. How do I know that your wife wouldn't read your notes? [I reassure her.] I'll tell you something of my life and then you can piece out the rest with the aid of the passages I marked in the essay I mentioned.

"My mother made my girlhood very unhappy. I was wild but not bad. I used to go out with the boys and the girls but I knew where to draw the line and went only just so far. The neighbors used to talk about me, but I never was guilty of actual wrongdoing. In the spring and the fall I used to work in an adjoining town and when I came home mother always accused me of things, said I dressed too attractively and was the talk of the town. She made us all very unhappy. I used to let the boys kiss me and I kissed them, but we never did anything sexual. When I left home, with forty dollars in my pocket, I was so mad at the world that I decided to go the limit and have the game as well as the name. In the train an elderly woman was attracted to me and I got quite confidential with her. She was in the business and offered me a job which I gladly accepted, tho she offered me a very small salary. I stayed one season with her. Next year I got a job in a wholesale house that paid me better—twelve dollars a week. Owing to the little that I was earning, I couldn't dress well and lived in very filthy and wretched surroundings. I gave up my job and began to look for something else, but had no luck. Finally somebody gave me a note of introduction to the superintendent of a wholesale house. He was very gruff and stern and all business, and didn't even look at me until I turned to go away. Then he turned and asked "Did I need work"; I said I did and he employed me. The work was very difficult

but I stuck to it. He was very patient with me but rough with the others. The girls soon noticed that he passed my work even if it wasn't up to standard and they said I had made a terrible hit with him. One day he called me to his desk, asked me about my work and a lot of questions about myself: where I lived and was I lonesome? He said he was lonesome too and would I go to a show with him some time. He was a short man and much older than I; I always disliked short men but I was reckless and desperate and sick of my work. I often wished I could be bad. He had a good position. So I let him call on me—he is my husband now. He told me he loved me and meant to marry me; but I had no intentions to marry him. I refused to be seen walking the streets with him because he was so short and Jewish looking; so I used to meet him at the theatre or in the restaurants. Till then I had often lived only on biscuits; he was liberal and spent a lot of money on me but I couldn't bear his touch—he disgusted me. I realize that it was all very, very mercenary. The girl with whom I roomed encouraged me to pull his leg. Then W. urged me to stop working, to stay home and buy anything I wanted. To people who met us and to my family I justified my conduct by telling them I was engaged. I was ashamed of what I was doing but I was too weak to give it up.

“W. had told me he was a divorced man. I didn't want to marry him but was letting him spend money on me and we went to live together in an apartment. He worshipped me always, but knew that I didn't care for him. I wrote home that I was married. When I saw women who had married for love going out to work I thought I didn't do so badly. We lived together this way for eight years, during which time we traveled a lot and lived in the swellest hotels. I wore wonderful clothes and fine jewelry, but I was always ashamed when I stood near him tho I liked him and was concerned about him; I really was. But at times we had terrible quarrels and I hated him like poison. He speculated a lot, associated with a very sporty group and made and lost money rapidly. Then we came to B. (the city where she now lives). He was informed that his wife had not divorced him. Then he told me the whole thing; he had been very mean to his wife and she had gone back to her parents. W. went into business with one of his brothers and I worked for him as an employee. This brother soon realized what my true position was and he helped us in getting W. a divorce from his wife. She got the divorce on statutory grounds: I was discovered in a hotel with W. Next day W. and I went to V. and were married. His family didn't like it.

[*Sixth Session.*] “I'm still afraid of you; I'm afraid you are hypnotising me—your movements are so quick and your eyes look at me so sharply. There is something uncanny about this treatment. It was a hard struggle for me to come to-day—that's why I'm three-quarters of an hour late. Willie fell and hurt his knee last night. [I omit details.] If you want me to talk to-day, you'll have to let me sit behind you. [She sits

in a chair behind me and lights a cigarette.] I always get cold hands and feet when I get in here. *The feeling I have for my husband is responsible for my hyper-sensitiveness and for thinking that people say things about me.* ["You mean, your contempt for him?"] Yes; some people have asked me how I ever came to marry him—his own sister asked me that. We are an oddly assorted couple and I never got over it. He is not only much shorter than I but is fifteen years older, and he looks a Jew—every inch of him. . . . When I'm in public with him I always feel apologetic about him. I never felt comfortable in the presence of short people. He is not a bad looking man and has a very intelligent and strong face but he is shorter than the average and I am much taller than the average. To make matters worse, he is quite stout. When we are in public the contrast between us makes people stare at us all the time. When I began to live with him I was conscious of the difference between us, but I did it because it was the easiest way. Then it became a habit. Besides, he was very kind and liberal and I was grateful to him for many things.

"We traveled a lot and he introduced me to many men. I had a fancy for men and admired them, but I never let him or them see that I was interested in them, but W sometimes remarked that I seemed more talkative and vivacious when strangers were around. I was always on my guard against the subtle flatteries that men hand out to women; I pretended not to understand. Hence I had the friendship of many men but managed to keep their respect. Then . . . this is the worst; I can hardly tell it. . . . A man came to the hotel one day, an English Jew, tall, very good looking. . . . We became acquainted, danced together and he dined with us. His deportment was perfect; he was a wonderful talker and had a charming personality. W liked him and we often took him autoing with us. He spent a great deal of time with us and there were many little incidents before it happened. . . . He paid me no compliments and treated me like an equal. Then his business took him to another city and we saw him only on Sundays. By this time W had remarked that he didn't like M's attentions—no, I won't tell you his name. [Goes into details about M. which may be omitted.] One Sunday the three of us were to go out autoing but W was suddenly called away on business; he saw my disappointment in my face and said that I should take M out for a ride. I did so and we had dinner together. Not a word passed between us that could have been objected to but we understood each other . . . Now comes something I don't understand. Though nothing had happened, he phoned me the next day that he thought it best not to see me any more. He said, "I can't trust myself any longer and you're a very poor actress"; and that he was getting to care for me more and more and was feeling like a skunk. I laughed it all off and next night we met again and had dinner together. I wasn't sure of my feelings; I was enjoying my adventure and kept telling myself it was only a flirtation. I had no intention

to do wrong. *I was only playing a game.* When he was away from V. he phoned me daily and then we began to correspond. I rented a letter-box in an adjoining town and I drove there for my mail daily. I wish you wouldn't write all this down. One day I met M and he warned me that we were playing with fire. He told me he cared for me too much to compromise me and he wanted to know if I could prevail on W to make me free. I promised M that I would bring this about but I really had no intention to do so. It may be that now, too, I was being actuated only by mercenary considerations. M wasn't making much money. One day I got a letter from him in which he said that he couldn't go on this way, that unless I took steps to get a divorce something would happen that we would both regret. The day on which I got that letter I happened to be busy with a customer (I was managing a store then) when W came in and went to my purse to get some change! He saw the letter, read it. I'll never forget the look in his face. When we got to the hotel he upbraided me, threatened to kill M, pleaded with me, cried, and wanted me to promise not to see or communicate with M again, at least not for a certain period.

Here is a peculiar thing: I wrote M that W was jealous and advised him not to see me for some time, but I never let him know that W had found his letter. After that I was very careful with my letters. I kidded M along; I lured him on and re-treated. It was the excitement of the game that I wanted and I had no intentions of leaving W or doing wrong with M. For about a year I kept this up, taking M out riding in the afternoons, to the neglect of our business. At times we would stop at some favorable spot on the road and chat; when I saw that M was getting worked up I would insist on getting into the car and would drive like mad; this was four years ago. He worshipped and idolized me, never taking any liberties with me except to kiss me. Loose women disgusted him. At times I thought of marrying him, but my heart sank every time I thought of what he would be sure to think of me if he found out I had lived with W eight years before marrying him. I didn't want to shatter his ideal; in his presence I never swore nor used slang nor smoked. *I lived only for him*, I felt younger and looked better; I longed to break away, but couldn't bring myself to do it. I made several sporadic efforts to terminate the relationship. Finally he terminated it in a letter in which he charged me with kidding him or not knowing my own mind. Then I was terribly upset but resolved it was better so, but I lost interest in life, in everything, and began to dance and drink more and more. A cocktail used to buoy me up and I began to court men's company. Now the hypnotic part comes in—it's worse than anything I've yet told you.

[*Seventh Session.*] "Very depressed to-day. Please let me sit behind you again. I have a feeling of disloyalty to speak so of my husband. Here is a portrait of him, and an old portrait of myself. There has been a terrible change in me in the past three years; I'm not the person I used to be. I begin to doubt

whether this treatment will benefit me. I'm beginning to think it is a waste of money, for I realize that *I lack the courage to say all I think*. What I need is probably some kind of worship, some kind of religion—something that's stronger than myself. I tried to read my Christian Science book, but it didn't help me. My manicure saw my depression and she advised me to go to Church. I told her I couldn't do that as it would make me feel like a hypocrite; then she urged me to see Father X. who, she said, is a very kindly and lenient Confessor. When I got there, however, I had forgotten Father X's name and was ushered into the presence of a very young man and I knew at once that he wouldn't do me any good. I talked to him for an hour but not frankly. He advised me to join the Church, but to me that would be a kind of idolatry. Father Z talked to me of faith and he gave me a catechism and some books, but I can't get my mind on them. I want to believe, *I want a religion*, but I am too old and sophisticated to have faith. I know that there are many non-religious people who are happy. I don't know what I want. *I don't understand myself*—no wonder people don't understand me. I'm not the same person two hours in succession. W says he never knows how he'll find me when he gets home; *I'm grouchy, cheerful, happy, depressed, by turns*.

"No, I can't talk to-day of the man with the hypnotic eyes. It may have been only a delusion. I'll tell you something else. After my flirtation with M, I went West for the Christmas holidays to see my family, but couldn't stand them longer than four days, notwithstanding all the trouble and expense. [I omit details of the trip and visit with the family.] While in the hotel in Chicago I struck up an acquaintance with a man who sat opposite me in the restaurant. He asked me to keep him company and we got into a conversation. When he learned that I intended to leave Chicago that night he coaxed me to stay over for another day, and the idea appealed to me. I hate to tell you all this; is it necessary to do so? ["You know the rule: everything that comes into your mind!"] He was nice looking, gentlemanly, and pointed out that nobody knew me there, and he urged me to look on it as a ship that passed in the night. I didn't dare to do it but I wished I could. He told me a great deal about himself. [Details omitted.] He prevailed on me to go to a cabaret with him. In the taxi he began to get familiar with me and I had difficulty in making him keep his place. When he saw I meant fight he desisted. Here's what I can't understand about myself: I wanted him and had everything in my favor; I was alone and wholly unknown; and yet I couldn't do it. He coaxed and argued but it was no use. It was almost time for me to catch my train and he accompanied me to the station. As soon as the train pulled out I was sorry I hadn't gone with him. I never met him again tho I had promised him to do so, but I often think of him. [Smokes and ruminates.]

"I hadn't gone the limit with M because I feared to lose his respect. After my affair with him terminated and before I

went West I was reckless, drank a lot, courted the company of men, enjoyed joking and kidding and listening to suggestive jokes. One man at the hotel, a typical woman chaser, began to pursue me and gave me no rest, but I put him off easily—he didn't appeal to me. Then I had a number of flirtations, one after the other—drank and went to the movies with three or four different men. The hotel in which we lived was popular with a very nice class of men, prosperous merchants and theatrical people. One man told me once that every automobile breaks up a family, and I thought that he was covertly lecturing me. Another man told me he knew that I wasn't happy, and he reminded me of a saying that to be young a woman ought to be in love with somebody all the time. He suggested that I take a sweetheart and offered himself in that capacity; so we jollied each other along. I'll call this man P. Then another man at the hotel (I'll call him R) warned me against P and told me that he (P) had boasted to the men that he would get me to take him out in my car and that he would get me some day and prove to the crowd that I wasn't different from other women. P had tried to get me to take him in my auto but I always refused. Tho R was very apologetic when he cautioned me against P, I resented it and told him I could take care of myself.

"R is the man with *the hypnotic eyes*. There was something queer about his eyes: there were white spots in the iris. I began to get a queer feeling about him. He was always doing something queer, or something to make me feel uncomfortable. He always kept his eyes on me. If I drank a cocktail in the restaurant he would look at me and then at the glass in such a peculiar way that I would have to put the glass down. At the most unexpected times he would walk behind my chair, and the moment I became conscious of his presence I got as cold as ice. And with it all he was always polite and gentlemanly, never said anything, but just haunted me with his hypnotic eyes. Is all this important? ["Unquestionably."] I'll phone you for another appointment if I want it.

[*Eighth Session.*] *Everything grates on my nerves.* W irritates me beyond endurance. I can't bear to have him speak to me. I'm having some dental work done and that too upsets me. [Omit details about her teeth, the dentist, his wife, and their unhappy marriage.] W and I just can't hit it off together; I can't bear his temper and his loud voice. No doubt his business worries aggravate him and he lets his spleen out on me. [Goes into details about W's business ventures and speculations.] At one time he and his brother formed a partnership and I helped them out by working for them and lending them money which I borrowed on my jewelry. That business was a terrible ordeal for me: the brothers quarrelled constantly—they swore at each other and threatened each other with knives and hammers. W can't bear to have anybody boss him; he must be it. One day he and I quarrelled about a piece of work I had made and he slapped me in the face in his brother's presence and I returned the compliment. I left him after that and stayed

away for a few days. I went back only because of his brother's solicitation, "for the sake of the business." Then W was as meek as a lamb, but he accused me of liking his brother and would not leave us alone together. One morning the "shrimp" insinuated something of the sort and grabbed me by the hair as I lay in bed; in self-defence I scratched his face. His brother told me, when he saw how I looked, that the next time W tried any rough stuff on me I should use an axe on him. Owing to W's bad temper and rages *my life was a veritable hell*. Finally the brothers dissolved partnership.

"Then, just before the war, W's first wife began to make trouble; she wanted more money. We were afraid of her because our marriage had been in violation of the law. So we moved out of the state and went to V., where we opened a store. But he raved and carried on so in the store, humiliating me in the presence of employees and customers, that one day I got my dander up, ordered everybody out of the store, locked the doors and told him I was through. That taught him a lesson. I understood the business much better than he, but he always interfered with me and my purchases; the result was that we lost money, and that made him still more irritable and quarrelsome and intolerable. *I'm always in a state of nervous tension*. He never talks without banging his fists on the table and he yells so that you'd think he'll raise the ceiling. *I feel walled in on all sides*. [Weeps.] *No wonder I want to commit suicide*. We haven't a single interest in common, not one. I don't think I could support mother and myself by my work. I've got to go on living with him and his vulgar associates—and oh, how vulgar they are! W's personal habits wear on me. All the little refinements of life mean nothing to him. He takes the spoon out of the coffee or the soup and puts it on the clean tablecloth! Bathing once a week is too much for him—to his family bathing is an event. One of his sister's children is a Mongolian idiot.

"Isn't all this enough to make anyone crazy? I ought to go to work, but he won't let me. One reason why I can't leave him is that he is so good to my mother. Besides, we haven't the money to open a business, and I couldn't bear the thought of his butting in (which he would be sure to do). That means I have to go on keeping house tho I hate everything about it and I hate myself when I do it. He is very untidy about the home, throws his clothes about everywhere and wipes his dirty hands on clean towels. If my mother weren't with me I would end it quickly. What would I do? I'd leave him and quickly, too. He says he hasn't heard me say that I liked or enjoyed anything in the past three years—and that's true!

"I still occasionally take a drink—homemade wine with a kick to it. Should I stop this? ["Suit yourself."] One drink is enough to make me feel happy and to enable me to forget my troubles and to make me want to do my housework, but I'd rather run a business, although I shudder to think of his yelling at me, as he used to do: "Go home, get out of here! who asked

you to say anything? you think you are making me rich by staying around here. Get out! Nobody wants you here!" Then he calls me back and apologizes. If I'm ill he is very much concerned, apparently he is.

"The other day I had a ridiculous dream: I came here and you were out; in your place there was another doctor, a woman and an attendant; the doctor said I wasn't ill but a medium and that spirits in me were trying to express themselves and that I ought to go to Europe and develop my mediumistic power; it was this room but everything in it was strange.

Session 9:—"Am feeling better and happier to-day and shall therefore sit in front of you. Some days I feel so bad that I just want to throw and smash things, and *sometimes I smash the dishes. I suddenly feel myself getting cold all over* though I felt fine when I came in; I wonder why. What did you write down when I came in? ["That you were a half hour late."] In my last two sessions I said a lot about W, but I am really to blame for a lot of our trouble; he is too old to change; I can soothe him easily enough if I want to, but I don't always feel like it. Sometimes I'm ugly and unreasonable. Yesterday I had a talk with his sister and she proposed that we go into business together, and she wondered why I went on living with W, and she wanted to know if he still had the "screaming spells" he used to have as a young man. But he is really not so bad; with a woman of his kind and who loved him as much as he loves me, and who would be more submissive, he would make a pretty good husband. We are together too much; I've become commonplace to him. I fully agree with the man who said that before thirty a woman isn't worth talking to and after thirty she isn't worth looking at.

"This brings me back again to the man with the hypnotic eyes. I was always *afraid of hypnotism*. The only thing that's been worrying me the last few days is your eyes. As I told you, at the hotel I danced with a great many people until I had the flirtation with M. *I used to take pleasure in watching the tactics pursued by the different men who tried to flirt with me.* They were always on the job as soon as they smelt that W and I had had a quarrel. I jollied Mr. P along and let him think that I was afraid of him.

"Mr. R, the man with the hypnotic eyes, was very slick and subtle; he was always courteous and gentlemanly and looked after me; he remembered all my likes and dislikes and was very attentive. Every time I passed him he had something pleasant to say to me. If W spoke harshly to me in his presence he would shake his head and look grieved. He had subtle ways of flattering me, as, for example, he would pretend to find striking resemblances between me and beautiful women pictured in the magazines. He noticed everything about me and even knew that I didn't take sugar in my coffee. I acted the role of the unsophisticated woman. When I went to my room at night he would say to me sympathetically, "And now you have to go to

bed with him!" I didn't like him but he amused me. He used to say nice things to friends who would be sure to bring them back to me. They told me he liked me and always talked of me. When I entered the parlor I would find him waiting for me and he would say, sotto voce, "It's about time." He never asked me to go out with him but he kept warning me against other men, and I didn't like that. One night we happened to be alone in the parlor and he got confidential, told me of his troubles with his wife and asked me why I didn't get a divorce from W; he pointed out that I had a great many friends who would be willing to take care of me. I told him I was thinking about it. Whereupon he urged me not to wait too long, said that he knew a man who thought a lot of me but was afraid to say anything. I pretended not to understand. Then he said he thought of me looking so sad and sweet and sitting there with him. By that time I had had enough, so I looked him in the face and said: "Say, cut it out! You're clever and amusing, but you are not running true to form to-night," and I laughed in his face; he got all red and was stunned. "Who is foolish?" I asked. "I am," he answered and went out.

"He didn't come near me for a long time after that. I used to take a delight in embarrassing him by winking at him when I saw him. I knew I had given him a terrible shock. He was furious with me and hated me. Every time I saw him I gave him a knowing look. He stood it for a while and then he turned the tables on me. Wherever I went I found him staring at me and his eyes always seemed to say, "You can't fool me; I understand you!" It began to get on my nerves and I was very uncomfortable. Everybody in the hotel noticed that I snubbed him on every occasion. It was embarrassing to him, too. One day he came up to me and said he wanted to know why I insulted him and he pretended I resented what he had said about P. I told him he knew what the trouble was and that I didn't want him to speak to me any more. This isn't the worst of the story, but I prefer to tell you about it another time.

[*Session 10*]:—"I'm afraid of two things: of something hypnotic and of losing my mind. Your disciplining me last time did me good; I'm early to-day. I had a swearsy day yesterday. W says I swear in my sleep and that I must have a Dib-bik (that's Jewish for an evil spirit) and that he would take me to a rabbi to have it driven out of me. I guess he was only joking. I really don't know what to talk about any more. My mother seems to be very much better recently; she reads continually; she talks to me more than she used to and even takes my side when W and I have an argument. He is always suspicious of me when I am quiet and says that I must be up to something. I imagine that at times he suspects me of being in touch with M. Two years ago he gave me to understand that M is still in New York and in business. I pretended not to be interested but made a mental note of the name of the firm with which W said M was connected and I looked him up in the

telephone book, but I never tried to get in touch with him. Subsequently W told me that M had called on him and wanted to go into partnership with him, but I advised against it. *I thought a lot of M*, but I don't want to see him—because I don't look as well as I used to. *I'm afraid to meet him*. W often sees M but never invites him to the house. I think a good deal of W's irritability is due to his suspicion that M and I sometimes meet.

"When you look at me I'm reminded of R and his hypnotic eyes, though you really don't look like him."

(To be continued.)

ON THE INHERITANCE OF ACQUIRED CHARACTERS

By ALEX. B. GUTMAN, Brooklyn, New York.

Are acquired characters hereditary? This question has often been propounded, only to be questioned over and over again. Brooks has called it "the interminable question," and Babcock speaks of it as follows: "The problem of the inheritance of acquired characters has been one of the historic battlegrounds of biology. Even yet the question is by no means settled, although a considerable amount of information has been collected about it."

If it is such a moot question, why should we concern ourselves about it altogether? We do so because it is intensely interesting to follow the great thinkers of biology through all their problems; to study their absorbing experiments; to ponder over their observations; to marvel at their conclusions; to joy in their successes and to sorrow in their disappointments. The best way to learn and appreciate men like Lamarck, Dalton, Darwin, and Weismann is to know what they did and how they accomplished it.

But the question of character inheritance is not merely one of chance interest. It is, as Walter declares, "a question of inestimable moment for breeders who are trying to maintain or improve particular strains of animals or plants; for physicians, who in fighting disease, are earnestly seeking to substitute an ounce of prevention for a pound of cure; for sociologists and philanthropists who have at heart the permanent bettering of human conditions; for educators, who cherish hopes that their life-work of unfolding the youthful mind may prove cumulative and lasting, rather than transitory; for religious workers who want their faith strengthened, that conquests in character building may outreach the individual and so enrich the race; for parents, who entertain hopes that their own efforts

may give their children a better biological start in life—for all these and many more, it is important to know the answer to the question: Can acquired characters be inherited?"

A great deal of misunderstanding and dissension has been caused by failure of those who believe in and those who deny the inheritance of acquired characteristics to interpret in the same way the terms involved. This confusion can be avoided by making clear the interpretation, doing this as explicitly as possible and at the very outset. Especially important is a clear understanding of the phrase "acquired character." This, Weismann, in accordance with his dualistic conception of the principles governing the development of the germ-plasm and body-plasm, defines as any somatic character produced by the responses of the soma to surrounding conditions or to its own activities." The tendency, however, of late has been to formulate a broader conception. Shull voices this attitude when he speaks of acquired characters as "modifications of bodily structures or habits which are impressed upon the organism in the course of its individual life." We must not be misled, however, that, as Beid brought out, every character present in the adult is acquired in the sense that it was not present at birth, thus it would be best to supplement Shull's definition by Ziegler's statement: "Only that can be 'acquired' which is produced in the course of individual life during and after the period of development, exclusively under the influence of external conditions; the term is in no way applicable to peculiarities which, as one says, arise of themselves from a predisposition *already present in the germ*." Or, as Conklin more tersely puts it, "Inherited characters are those whose instinctive or differential causes are in the germ cells, while acquired characters are those whose distinctive causes are environmental." This distinction makes certain hereditary recurrences, such as of polydactylism, haemophilia, color-blindness, etc., in man, or the absence of horns in cattle and tails in cats, irrelevant to the question under discussion.

In making clear the three classes of characters which are differentiated by the above definitions, it would, perhaps, be best to follow Redfield by quoting his well-known dictum and drawing examples therefrom:

"Some are *born* great,
Some *achieve* greatness
Some have greatness *thrust* upon them."

The first class, the "born" characters, are in no sense acquired,

and are thus excluded here from discussion. In this category fall characters like the color of hair and of eyes, facial features and other Mendelian factors of heredity.

The second class, the "achieved" characters, have their potential capacity for development in the germ-plasm and require use, exercise, and external environmental stimuli for their development. These shall also be excluded here from discussion, in accordance with Ziegler and Conklin. To this class belong such qualities as musical genius, great literary ability, etc.

The third class, the "thrust" characters, are true acquired characters, and with these we shall deal. They are due solely to the environment and are independent of all use or disuse by the organism; they include conditions like mutilations, diseases, etc. To this class also belong what are generally referred to as congenital characters, such as blindness caused by parental gonorrhea, or tubercular intrauterine infection; these, of course, being "thrust" characters due to environmental influences while in the foetal stage and are not to be confused with "born" characters.

Our question finally evolves itself into—Are "thrust" characters hereditary? But when is *any* character hereditary? Weismann said that in order for a character to be, beyond question, truly hereditary, it must fulfill the following requirements:

1. A particular somatic acquired character must be the definite result of a perfectly definite and known environmental cause.

2. The particular somatic acquired character must be one entirely new not only to the organism experimented with but one not exhibited by any of its ancestors; otherwise, there may be a question of its being merely the recurrence of a previous latent germinal character.

3. That a particular somatic acquired character must be present in successive generations, extending at least to the third, without the presence of the original causal factor. The condition may diminish in extent or intensity with each generation, but its mere presence makes it hereditary.

We are now ready to revise our question in such a way as to eliminate all mistaken construing: Can a "thrust" character fulfill the three requirements requisite in the inheritance of a character? We can modify the question still further when we realize that the germ cell is the only connecting link between two generations, and that any acquired character must in some way be impressed upon the germ plasm itself, if it is to be transmitted. So that our original question amplifies and particularizes itself

into that put by J. Arthur Thompson: Can a structural change in the body, induced by some change in use or disuse, or by a change in surrounding influences, affect the germ cells in such a specific or representative way that the offspring will, through its inheritance, exhibit, even in a slight degree, the modification which the parent acquired?

At first glance, an affirmative answer seems obvious. For how then would there be any advance, any progress, unless the acquirements of one generation were handed down to the next, if not in toto, at least in the form of a slightly greater propensity, a somewhat enhanced facility for the achievement of the parent? If we had as much difficulty in doing a certain thing as our ancestors, should we not now be doing it as imperfectly as they did? Such was the belief of the ancient teachers of evolution—witness Aristotle's remark—"children resemble their parents not only in congenital characters, but in those acquired later in life." Buffon and Erasmus Darwin both appear to have inclined towards a belief in the heritance of acquired characters; but the great champion of this doctrine was Lamarck, whose ideas in this regard are expressed in the last of his four laws: "Everything which has been acquired, impressed upon, or changed in the organization of individuals during the course of their life is preserved by generation and transmitted to new individuals who have descended from those which have undergone these changes." Here is a clear, concise, affirmative answer to our question and it is this Lamarckian doctrine which has been a storm center of discussion from the time of the publication of his "*Philosophie Zoologique*" until this very day.

Beginning with Darwin, we find real opposition to the belief in the inheritance of acquired characters. In a letter to his friend Hooker, Darwin expressed a great deal of doubt concerning the doctrines of Lamarck. We find, nevertheless, in the "*Origin of Species*," a constant reference to the inheritance of acquired characters. It appears that Darwin felt that there was in his theory of natural selection a certain insufficiency to explain all the phases of evolution, and in otherwise unexplainable cases he sometimes fell back upon the ideas of Lamarck. In fact, he felt it necessary to improvise a mechanism for the transmission to the germ cells of acquired characters and propounded his theory of pangenesis by means of gemmules. It was to these occasional reversions to Lamarckism and to his doctrine of pangenesis that followers of Darwin took exception, and this led to the Neo-Darwinian school, based on a pure con-

ception of natural selection untainted by any suggestion of the inheritance of acquired characters. Its leader was August Weismann. It is in this school that we find the first complete and absolute denial of the inheritance of acquired characters. Weismann's work seems so conclusive, that his ideas are in general acceptance to-day, being confirmed apparently, by the work of our geneticists and experimentalists.

Such, in brief, have been the beliefs of the foremost exponents and interpreters of the evolutionary doctrine; efforts to solve the great mystery of the propelling force, the causal agency, the method of evolution. It is interesting to review, in a general way, the various experiments and observations that led up to those conclusions. We shall consider, first, those tending to confirm the doctrine of Lamarck and the inheritance of acquired characters, and finally, we shall try to draw from out of the maelstrom of conflicting evidences and opinions, a warranted and logical deduction—a most difficult task.

The environment may conceivably influence an organism toward the acquirement of new characters in two ways:

1. By acting directly upon the germ plasm, either affecting or not affecting the somato-plasm at the same time, and
2. By acting upon the somato-plasm only, and through the agency of the somato-plasm influence the character of the germ plasm.

As regards the first, we have considerable evidence that the environment can have a direct effect upon the germ plasm. I shall cite some of the more important evidence substantiating it:

(a) Sitkowski, by feeding the caterpillars of *tineola biselliella* Sudan red III., obtained colored eggs which hatched into colored caterpillars.

(b) Riddle did the same thing with guinea pigs.

(c) Gage, of Cornell, did the same with poultry.

(d) MacDougal, by injecting solutions of sugar, potassium iodide, and Zinc sulphate into the ovaries of various plants before fertilization, modified the progeny, and characters so introduced bred true.

(e) Tower, by varying the conditions of temperature, humidity, and atmospheric pressure while females of *septinotarsa* were laying their eggs, could produce at will melanic or albino individuals which bred true.

(f) Bardeen showed that the germ cells are injuriously affected by X-rays and radium at the time of fertilization.

(g) Fisher created a new species of moth by subjecting the pupæ of *arctia caja* to low temperature.

(h) Stockard produced weak and degenerate offspring in guinea pigs by affecting their productive glands with alcohol, ether and lead.

(i) Voisin and Perou have shown that an epilepsy toxin directly affects young in utero.

Most of these experiments qualify, in a measure, as acceptable data, since they pass the requirements of an acquired character and for inheritance, but there are, nevertheless, certain serious objections which must be considered. Notice must be taken that they were carried out with organisms comparatively low in the biological scale of life, where extrinsic factors have ample opportunity to come in direct contact with the germ plasm, and thus materially affect it. In higher forms, where the reproductive cells are in the interior of the organism and thus protected from an environment of varying temperature, humidity, pressure, and from actual contact with deleterious substances, the chances for such direct external influence are quite negligible. The only gamete-affecting medium in such forms being the blood, the possibilities of such influence will be discussed later in connection with Guyer's work.

Another phase of this direct influence upon the germ cell that must be taken into consideration is the fact that the Neo-Darwinians are in full accord with both the results and the conclusions drawn. They agree that if the environment directly affects the germ, the general resulting characters will be inherited; they call it "parallel induction." But they point out that we have not here a *somatic* character being impressed upon the germ plasm; that this is not a true "thrust" character. In this they are completely justified; nevertheless we can not overlook the possibility that in "parallel induction," if capable of coming into play in higher organisms through the instrumentality of the blood stream, we may have a potent factor of evolution; what Darwin with his "gemmules," Haeckel with his "plastidules," Weismann with his "biophors," Nageli with his "micella," Galton with his "stirps," de Vries with his "pangens," Semon with his "engrammes," and Morgan with his "genes" tried to represent as filling the void they felt in the causal chain of evolution. And as such, the Neo-Darwinians deserve due consideration.

But there is also evidence falling into the second category of the formation of hereditary characters by the action of the

ACQUIRED CHARACTERS—GUTMAN

environment upon the somato-plasm with a concomitant transfer and change in the character of the germ plasm. These observations can be conveniently classified into four major divisions of acquired characters:

1. Mutilations.
2. Environmental effects.
3. The effects of use or disuse.
4. The transmission of disease.

1. As regards the inheritance of mutilations, there is little to say beyond the mention of a few admittedly exceptional cases, of which I shall cite one noted by Eimer. Decandolle pledges himself for the veracity of a story concerning a girl who in 1797 suffered an accident resulting in a scar and loss of hair extending over a distance of five centimeters in the region of the ear. In 1800 she bore a son who lacked hair in the same area, and his grandson, in 1866, suffered the same effect. There are other cases of the same nature, to say nothing of the stories of parental influence, but the one related above is typical and should suffice.

2. The next series of observations, based upon environmental effects, is far more convincing, and contains evidences from nature and from artificial human experimentation which seem to be of great weight:

(a) Negroes are black, ostensibly because they have been exposed to the hot sun for generations until their color became hereditary. Moreover, Hartmann traces a consistently darker complexion as he proceeds from lower Egypt south, in proportion to the climatic conditions.

(b) Lederbaur finds that the weed *capsella* with Alpine characteristics retains these when transplanted to the lowlands.

(c) Sumner produced mice with abnormally large ears, tail, and feet by subjecting pregnant females to high and constant temperatures.

(d) Marie von Chauvin transformed the gill-breeding axolote into the lung-breathing *amblystoma* by decreasing the water in the aquarium habitat.

(e) Kammerer, by reducing the water-supply, changed *salamandra maculosa* from the normal producer of seventy eggs hatching in water into gill-breathing tadpoles to a variety producing two to seven salamanders living out of water and without gills. Moreover, salamanders with black and yellow spots lose the black when reared on yel-

low soil, and the offspring are more yellow than the normal. This work has been called in question and requires confirmation.

(f) Boll transformed *saturnia luna* into a different species by feeding the caterpillars European walnut leaves instead of hickory.

(g) Shetland ponies seem to have decreased in size because of a paucity of provender.

(h) Similarly, "the immense size of the lepidoptera of the East Indies is to be ascribed to the moisture and heat of the climate; and on the other hand, the small size of the Australian forms is to be attributed to the dryness of the Australian climate." (Gabriel Koch.)

(i) The same reasons hold for the small *papilio* species of Java, and the large ones of Celebes, both of the same original stock (Eimer).

(j) The same holds for the small fox of the Isle of Man as compared with that of the mainland (Wallace).

(k) Schmankewitch observed that increase of saltiness in a lake in Russia within three years converted *Artemia salina* into *Artemia Milhausenii*, and he produced the same change by a similar process with *Daphinae*.

These are some of the evidences in favor of the inheritance of acquired characters due to environmental influence. Some of the experiments have been challenged, and others have been interpreted by the opposition in plausible terms of natural selection; the rest have been explained away in other ways. But facts are facts; their interpretation is another matter depending on individual opinion.

(3) Another series of effective arguments advanced by the Neo-Lamarckians regarding the use and disuse of organs:

(a) Rabbits liberated in 1418 on the island of Porto Santo developed into small, ratlike, nocturnal, reddish-colored, and grey bellied animals, forming a new species.

(b) Hogs liberated in Bermuda several centuries ago, in an effort to adapt themselves, developed into sinewy, fleet, smaller, darker animals.

(c) Phacechoems have callosities on their knees, the effects apparently of their habit of kneeling to dig for roots.

(d) The constant lowering of the trotting records seems to point to the inheritance of characteristics resulting from training (Brewster).

ACQUIRED CHARACTERS—GUTMAN

(e) The instincts of animals—the pointing of bird-dogs, the inflation of the pouter-pigeon, the tumbling of the tumbler pigeon—indicate the same.

(f) The eyes of animals living in the dark degenerate through disuse (Lamarck).

(g) The domestic cat has a longer intestine than the wild cat because a more or less herbivorous animal requires a longer intestine (Eimer).

(h) All atrophied organs are due to disuse and are inherited.

(i) Horns originated from the use of the head in butting.

(j) Children born of very old parents seem to have a prematurely old appearance (Eimer).

(k) And the familiar argument concerning the stretching of the giraffe's neck.

These are a few instances of the many suggested to show that the use or disuse of an organ will, in time, bring about a corresponding growth or atrophy which is inherited.

(4) Finally, believers in the inheritance of acquired characters point to the inheritance of diseases as proof of their doctrine. They designate gout, tuberculosis, alcoholic propensities, short-sightedness, epilepsy, deaf-mutism, and various nervous and mental diseases as failings contracted during the life of an individual and passed on as a hereditary character. Of special significance are the experiments of Brown-Sequard who, by dividing the sciatic nerve or a portion of the spinal cord, showed the inheritance of epilepsy; and by injury to the corpus restiforme in the parents demonstrated the inheritance of morbid changes in the eyes of forty guinea pigs, by a division of the sciatic nerve in the parents he produced an inheritance in twenty guinea pigs of loss of phalanges and muscular atrophy of the thigh. Sumner repeated these operations but could not get the same results, and furthermore, they are of doubtful importance in the opinion of geneticists in general.

It is upon experiments and observations such as these mentioned above, that those advocating the doctrine of the inheritance of acquired characters base their belief. Around the evidences as a core, they wind a coil of pertinent questions and expressions of doubt concerning the complete efficacy of Weismann's theory of the continuity of germplasm.

For, they ask, if the blastogenic principle is so inviolate, what then is the cause of germinal variation, leading to individual

variation, and what is the cause of mutations? We have had various answers: Weismann's theory of panmixia, and the chemical instability of protoplasm among others. Suffice it to say that Bateson, who gives 886 cases of discontinuous variations among animals, says, "Inquiry into the causes of variation is, in my judgment, premature;" which makes it appear likely that the theory of germinal continuity will not be able to account for variations. "What is a spontaneous change?" asked Guyer, "and why should we consider germ cells immortal when all else is mortal?"

And how explain intelligibly the presence of vestigial organs, if not through disuse? The hind legs of the whale, for instance, were not needed when that animal took to a marine habitat; they were therefore not used; less blood supply was thus needed; less blood supply, less nutrition, less growth; and hence in time the vestigial limbs. Is this process not more rational than J. L. Taylor's explanation that the organism as a whole is selected, and that there are likely to be present unfavorable as well as favorable variations?

And how, in the Neo-Darwinian scheme, are practically unfavorable body parts like antlers on a deer or the tooth of the sabre-toothed tiger to be explained? And how can minor variations, like a rib, super or hyponumerary, be a potent factor in natural selection? And how is it possible for the blastogerm, a body tissue absolutely independent of the rest of the body, to be contrary to the universal condition of every other tissue? Since the germ plasm exerts a tremendous effect on the secondary sexual characters of the soma, why could the soma not have a corresponding influence on the germ plasm?

These are some of the pointed inquiries of the Neo-Lamarckians. To be sure they have all been answered more or less satisfactorily. But is there any question which cannot be answered by an ingenious and enthusiastic scientist, which can not be covered with what appears to be a logical shield?

Now let us turn to the evidence presented by the Neo-Darwinians as indicative of the non-inheritance of acquired characters. And what a formidable array of marshalled facts and recorded observations it is! Their presentation would perhaps, be best attained by following in the path of Weismann and thus leading up to the subsequent work of later observers which seems to verify his conclusions. Weismann's three main postulates are:

1. The germ cells are completely independent of the soma,

ACQUIRED CHARACTERS—GUTMAN

and there is no known means by which the barrier between the two can be broken down, allowing the somatic characters to influence in any specific way the germ plasm itself.

2. The evidence submitted to support the inheritance of acquired characters is unsatisfactory and only possible of explanation in terms of natural selection.

3. The theory of the continuity of germ plasm is sufficient in itself to explain the phenomena of heredity without recourse to inheritance of acquired characters.

In elaborating Weismann's first statement, it is necessary to realize the fundamental importance he attaches to the complete separation of the germ cells from the remainder of the body; for upon the totality of absence of all exchanges between these two entities he rests his whole case. The attempted verification of this conception has led to various expressions of opinion and experimental observations, of which I shall cite a few:

(a) Physiologists declare such a complete independence impossible in an organism.

(b) The various observers, including Child, have actually observed cells differentiating as primitive muscle cells return to the germ cell stage.

(c) Walker, Farmer, and Moore have all noted a significant resemblance between cancer and germ cells.

(d) The ability of a plant leaf, like *Begonia*, to reproduce the whole plant indicates the presence of germ cells in the leaves.

(e) If a segment of one of the *Annelida* worms containing no observable germ cells is cut off, it will regenerate into a worm with germ cells.

(f) Guthrie transplanted the ovaries of one fowl into another and concluded that the foster mother had a direct effect upon the ova inside the ovary.

(g) There is no known physiological factor to stamp a specific somatic character upon the germ, except that recently proposed by Guyer, to be discussed later.

(h) Conklin asks how defective nutrition causing rickets could affect the germ plasm that has no bones? Or over-exertion, causing hypertrophy of the heart affect the germ plasm that has no heart? Or loss of eyes or teeth or legs, affect the germ plasm having none of these, in such a way as to produce offspring?

(i) Guthrie's experiment could not be repeated by Davenport.

(j) Castle and Phillips prove conclusively that transplanted ova are in no way affected by the foster mother by placing the ovary of a black guinea pig in place of the ovary of a white one, mating with white guinea pigs, and obtaining three litters of black offspring (it will be remembered that black is a Mendelian dominant).

(k) Harrison spliced the anterior half of *Rana sylvatica* to the posterior half of *R. palustris* and found that they maintained their individual peculiarities up to the adult stage.

(l) Grafted branches of trees reproduce their own kind.

(m) The persistence of unchanged Mendelian factors practically proves the unchanged condition of the germ cells.

The evidence supporting Weismann in this contention seems so conclusive that it is only very recently that any real opposition has developed. His next statement was more troublesome to prove, but a mass of evidence has been produced which can be conveniently classified in the same way that the evidence on the other side was divided:

1. Mutilations.
2. Environmental effects.
3. The effects of use or disuse.
4. The transmission of disease.

There are a great many instances that can be cited to show that mutilations are not inherited. But as we know this to be true in our own experience, we shall mention relatively few:

- (a) Battle scars are not inherited.
- (b) Chinese women have had their feet bound for centuries, but the resulting deformity is not inherited.
- (c) Circumcision has been practiced for centuries but is not hereditary.
- (d) Flat head Indians do not inherit the peculiar-shaped skull; it must be formed anew with each generation.
- (e) Crippling of the little toe is not due to generations of tight shoes, since Wiedesheim pointed out that Egyptians who did not wear tight shoes, had the same effect.
- (f) Sheep and horses have been docked for centuries but the condition is not inherited.
- (g) Dogs have had their ears clipped for a long time without having them inherited.

ACQUIRED CHARACTERS—GUTMAN

(h) Weismann decaudalized twenty-two generations of mice without affecting the length of the tail.

In the face of all these facts, we can not deny that, despite a few random instances, mutilations are not inherited. Similarly, there are certain observations advanced to show that environment has no effect upon the soma which the latter will transmit specifically to the germ plasm, and here are some of the more important instances brought forward:

(a) Trees deformed and crippled by wind and storm do not produce modified progeny.

(b) The tan of parents long abiding in tropical climes is not transmitted to their offspring.

(c) Naegeli found that varieties of plants showing the effects of generations of exposure to Alpine conditions, lost those characters when transplanted to the less adverse conditions of the Botanical Garden of Munich.

(d) The Porto Santo rabbits referred to above are said to have reverted to the original ancestral form within three years in the favorable environment of the Zoo.

(e) Limitation of full food supply of the parent may cause dwarfing of the progeny (induction) and even of the third generation (pre-induction) but resumption of a normal food supply brings about normality of the individual.

(f) The Jews have lived in slums and ghettos for ages, but still show no signs of physical deterioration due to unfavorable environment.

These are the arguments advanced by the Neo-Darwinians to prove that the environment has no effect upon the germ cell which was acted upon through the agency of the soma. To explain the evident harmony between the organism and its environment and the seeming causo-resultal relationship between the two, they submit the theory of natural selection; it is not the inheritance of characters because of the environment that is the cause of adaptation, but the natural selection of favorable variations. And to justify the adequacy of their explanation, they submit the following experiments:

(a) Weldon found that an increase in the amount of China clay in the water contained in an aquarium filled with crabs resulted in the death of a number, and the survival of a variety with a greater mean frontal breadth.

(b) Cesnola found that *Mantis religiosa*, placed against harmonious backgrounds, survived, while the others were eaten by birds.

(c) Poulton and Sanders found that protective coloration was a potent factor in natural selection of various pupae.

(d) Davenport found that the color of chickens was a great factor in their survival, since those who were conspicuous in their environment were destroyed by hawks.

With the facts presented by the Neo-Lamarckians to show that organs used by the animal are well developed and those not in use are under-developed, the followers of Weismann do not as a general rule take exceptions. But the interpretation is a different matter. Thus, a giraffe has a long neck; granted. But this is not due to generations of stretching, but to the natural selection of those with variations towards a longer neck. The legs of a horse are not well developed because of generations of training, but because of the survival of the fleetest; not use but selection. And similarly, animals in caves are not blind because of the disuse of their eyes, but because their eyes are no longer a factor in a struggle for existence, and blind animals are as fit for selection as those who can see. The sole of the human foot has a thicker skin than any other part of the body—just where it is used most, the functionalists would point out. But so has *Necturus maculatus*, an animal that locomotes in a way which should not produce such a pronounced thickening. And, as Walker points out, "The strong arm, the skilled hand, and the trained ear are not inherited," yet they are all the results of use. Inherited instincts cannot be the results of use, since instincts like breaking the egg by a chick, spinning a cocoon by a caterpillar, and digestion of the yolk sacs by a fish, occur only once in the life of the organism.

Finally, Neo-Darwinians deny without any reservation the inheritance of disease. What is inherited is the weakness of the resistance towards, or an active propensity for, a particular disease; which is a very different thing. For these diseases are caused by pathogenic bacteria, and these latter cannot be an integral part of either the ovum or the sperma. What is inherited is the Mendelian factor of lowered resistance which requires external stimuli to make the disease really develop; it is merely the potentiality to get the disease, not the disease that crosses the "hereditary bridge." Concerning gout, for instance, D. J. Hamilton says, "The gouty habit of body has arisen as a variation, and as such is hereditarily transmissible; excess of diet and alcohol merely renders the habit of body apparent." As Thomson puts it, "a microbe cannot be part of an inheritance." Into this category fall diseases like tuberculosis, some

ACQUIRED CHARACTERS—GUTMAN

nervous diseases, like epilepsy; cataract, color blindness, cancer, arteriosclerosis, obesity, certain forms of rheumatism and of heart and kidney diseases. According to the U. S. Hygienic Laboratory, even induced immunity is not inherited, which would not hold if the diseases themselves were transmissible.

The apparent inheritance of a weakness for alcohol or opium may be explained either in some cases by "parallel induction" or by an inherent weakness of the germ-plasm itself—the absence of a Mendelian factor of resistance. As regards the so-called inheritance of syphilis and gonorrhea, we must remember that we are dealing here with congenital and not hereditary infection. Dr. Ogilvie says: "Wherever the transmission of infectious disease from parent to offspring has been adduced to support the doctrine of the inheritance of acquired characters, it has been done in utter misconception of its meaning and scope."

Because of the experiments and observations classified into the four main divisions given above, the Neo-Darwinians feel that they have justified Weismann's contention that the evidence produced in favor of the inheritance of acquired characters is unsatisfactory, and can be explained in terms of natural selection and germinal continuity. This brings us to Weismann's last claim; that the facts of heredity can be interpreted with scientific proof by his theory without the assumption that acquired characters are inherited. Suffice it to say that in our present ignorance as to the causes of variations and of mutations, it is impossible to say whether they will conflict with the conception of Weismann or not; that the experiments performed and observations reported can be explained by those conceptions cannot be denied; but then many of them can be equally well explained by the inheritance of acquired characters. However, it must be admitted that the results of experimental breeding and the sciences of genetics, cytology and embryology strengthen the position of the Neo-Darwinians tremendously.

These are the claims on both sides, the pros and cons of the question. To try to draw a conclusion where opinions and interpretations clash distressingly, is our arduous task; the position of one who seeks to sit in judgment, who seeks to sift the accredited from the contested and doubtful, is indeed a difficult one. Whether on the other hand, the Neo-Lamarckians insist that the callosities of the Phacechoems are due to the use of the knees in bending over, and on the other hand, the Neo-Darwinians with just as much vehemence and sincerity assert that these same callosities

are the result of natural selection, which conclusion *can* we come to? And just when we have agreed with Lamarck that blindness of cave animals is due to the disuse of the eyes, and are strengthened in our belief by Kapterew, who caused hereditary blindness in water flees by keeping them in the dark, where shall we turn when Walker gives us an equally satisfactory explanation based upon natural selection? The difficulty we are almost constantly confronted with is the formation of diametrically opposed conclusions, expressed with the greatest conviction and drawn from the same, identical observations.

But conflicting as the evidence is, it is clear that there is an indisputable preponderance on the side of the Neo-Darwinians and against the inheritance of acquired characters. The whole new science of genetics seems one grand indictment of all such inheritance, and the ever increasing number of geneticists seems to agree with Conklin when he concludes that:

(1) "Developed characters are never transmitted by heredity, and the hereditary constitution of the germ is not changed by changes in such characters.

(2) Possibly environmental stimuli acting upon germ cells at an early stage of their development may rarely cause changes in hereditary constitution, but changes produced in somatic cells do not cause corresponding changes in the hereditary constitution of the germ cells.

(3) Germ cells, like somatic cells, may undergo modifications which are not hereditary. All such cases are known as 'induction.'

(4) Environment may profoundly modify individual development, but it does not generally modify heredity."

The great majority of men qualified to judge have decided that acquired characters are not inherited. They are the Neo-Darwinians, following in the footsteps of Dalton and Weismann. To oppose them, there remain scattered groups of Neo-Lamarckians, notably Semon, who has formulated a "mneme" theory based on the significant resemblance between memory and heredity, and Rignano, with his conception of "centro-epigenesis;" and those who attribute to the will the great factor of evolution, as is the opinion of George Bernard Shaw.

It seems, therefore, that the discussion over this vexing problem will soon cease because of the expected solution of the question itself. And yet, there still remains in the minds of many biologists a feeling that the tale has not yet been completely told; a growing conviction that there is a void some-

ACQUIRED CHARACTERS—GUTMAN

where, a missing link in the causal chain of evolution; that natural selection, with its concomitant denial of the inheritance of acquired characters, can not entirely account for the progressive character of the trend of evolution. They feel with Sumner the "utter bankruptcy of the Mendelian-Mutation scheme of things to account for the origin of adaptive structures and functions." Some even go as far as Heribert-Nilsson and deny evolution entirely, in view of the stability of the Mendelian factors.

These men find a new trail in the recent work of Guyer, who succeeded in making an acquired character—blindness caused by the injection of an anti-lens serum into the blood—hereditary to the eighth generation in rabbits, under conditions meeting every scientific requirement. Whether this will lead to an ultimate solution of the problem, whether this experiment will lead to others that will verify the opinions of Lamarck, and prove that acquired characters are hereditary, or whether it is the last gasp of a dying doctrine we cannot say; time will tell. It is only fair to say, however, that the interest with which our biologists are turning towards these latest developments is significant.

We cannot underestimate the importance of the hormones in our body, and that these hormones might have had no inconsiderable part to play in the solution of living forms is a possibility worth considering. As Babcock and Clausen put it, "It is not inconceivable that a bodily effect might be impressed upon the germ cells by hormones liberated into the blood stream by the nuclear constituents of affected body cells." And in this connection it is interesting to recall the experiments of Gudernatsch who produced from tadpoles a race of frogs the size of flies by feeding them thyroid extract, and a race of tadpoles which did not develop into frogs at all, by feeding them thymus extract. At any rate, the pendulum seems to be swinging the other way.

Are acquired characters hereditary? Before the days of Weismann, the answer would have been "yes"; from Weismann until a comparatively short time ago, "No"; but to-day, with its new doubts and suggestions of new possibilities, the only answer is a request to await developments and see what the future may bring forth.

867 St. Marks Avenue.

THE CASE AGAINST MARRIAGE

By F. Newkirk, New York.

I love my wife, but I hate the word "wife," just as I hate the words "king," "subject," "master," "slave," or any word that the race has outgrown. These words have been outgrown because the institutions for which they stand have been found to be in the way of humanity's progress.

This progress of the human race is, I believe, more clearly seen now than ever before since the records of history began to be written. We know where we are going. The next big station ahead is that called Liberty, the real freedom of the individual life. We are getting a clearer idea now of what freedom is than we have ever had before, and because we see more clearly what it really is, we know that we are getting nearer it. We understand now that liberty means not freedom to hate or to destroy, not freedom to rule over others, but freedom to do the work we want to do, to create the things we want to make. We are understanding what life means, that it is the opportunity to take all our desires, passions, purposes, ambitions, dreams, and longings, and, by free and unrestrained self-expression, bring into being things that would not exist if it were not for us and for the desires that drive us.

In your rambles through the country you have noticed two saplings growing too near together, the branches, even the trunks becoming so intertwined that neither of the saplings can ever become a tree. The tree that is ever to become a giant of the forest, a tree that shall ever be of use as a ship's mast, or a sturdy timber in some worthy structure, must stand and grow alone. A tree that does not stand alone never becomes a tree,

THE CASE AGAINST MARRIAGE—NEWKIRK

and the individual who never learns to be self-reliant, to make his own choices, to create in daily freedom the things he wants to make never becomes a genuine personality.

Perhaps, before going further we had better stop and find out just what we mean by marriage. I was interested in the article by Mr. W. L. George, appearing in a recent number of a monthly magazine, and noted his sharp contradiction of the charge that many scientists believe the human race will outgrow the institution of marriage. In fact it was I who had made the charge in a letter I had written Mr. George. Mr. George says that this is not possible, and expresses the courageous conviction that those who do think so can hardly be scientists or scholars.

Whatever my standing may or may not be as a scientist or a scholar, I do take the liberty of disagreeing with Mr. George and declaring my conviction that the human race not only will outgrow marriage, but has outgrown it. I do not know quite what Mr. George means by marriage, but this is what I mean by it: *Marriage is an agreement between a man and a woman which gives one or both some right to control the actions of the other.* It is important, but perhaps not fundamental, to note that marriage as it is now known must have either the sanction of the church or of the state to be genuine. It is also true historically that marriage is largely an economic institution, founded and continued for the purpose of guaranteeing the sustenance and protection of children during their years of dependence.

Now what does the modern student of psychology and sociology say about all these things? In the first place, he repudiates entirely any thought of the authority of the church. The idea that any such historic institution as the church has the right to control the acts of individuals is contrary to the modern understanding of human progress. And something of the same attitude is growing up toward the state. The number of those who challenge the right of the state to control the acts of the individual is growing constantly larger. Even fairly extreme anarchists will acknowledge that the group has some rights to which the rights of the individual must be subservient. But they insist that the best interests of the group lie in the direction of the utmost freedom for the individual, particularly if that freedom lies in the direction of freedom to act, to work, to produce, to create.

What I did like about Mr. George's article was his implication that the paramount duty of each individual is to make the most of his own life. He pictures the home of the future

as a suite of rooms in a colossal apartment house, mother and father going out every day to work on their chosen tasks, leaving the children in the care of experts who choose this kind of work because they like it, because they are proficient in it. Mr. George says also that divorce will be easy and will be granted universally for one cause alone, namely, the disinclination of either the man or the woman to continue the marriage relation. Mr. George is coming along but he has not quite arrived at the modern point of view. He allows that for a time, either limited or unlimited, the man is under a certain sort of obligation for his conduct and his habits to the woman he calls his wife, and the woman is under a similar obligation to the man she calls her husband. This, it seems to me, is fundamentally contradictory to the real essence of liberty, which is the real essence of life.

It is really quite amusing to notice how people who pretend to talk frankly about these modern ideas and to face facts as they are, are so unwilling to begin at the beginning. Marriage is at best merely a hypothesis, an experiment. In various places and periods people have tried polyandry, or the system of many husbands for one woman, polygamy, or the system of many wives for one husband, or monogamy, one wife for one husband. Americans happen to live historically and geographically, in place and time, where monogamy is the alleged practice. But we all know perfectly well that it is only alleged, and that even the allegation is very slight.

It is needless to go here into the many proofs that this is the case. Each reader need only look back a few months or years in his own experience to note how he has been surprised to find that one person or another of his own acquaintance who has presumed to be living under the requirements of the marriage idea, was not doing so at all. This is the worst thing about marriage, that it is essentially a lie. It is demoralizing always for people to profess to be doing what they are not doing, to profess to believe in the sacredness of vows which they are more or less constantly violating.

An institution that existed in America for nearly a generation in the heart of New York State not many years ago, offers a wide field of data for those seeking light in the practical problems of sex relationships. It was known as the Oneida Community and a number of learned treatises have been written about it as a sociological phenomenon. It was broken up in its old form

by political legislation, but some of the former members of the Community are still living and are willing to talk about the happy days of the old regime. I had the good fortune to meet three of these survivors recently. One of them was an old gentleman, cultured, religious; the other two were a charming couple, now man and wife, also cultured and clearly interested in matters of social welfare. From the lips of the first-named gentleman I had a graphic description of the plan of life of this happy and prosperous Community.

Its members lived as one family, the basis of their association being distinctly religious. They were communistic in the literal interpretation of that word and their rejection of marriage was due to an interpretation of their leader, Westcott, of a passage in the second chapter of Acts which states that the early Christians "had all things in common . . . neither said any of them that aught of the things that he possessed belonged to himself." Since wives had been reckoned up to the time this history was written to be part of a man's possessions, Westcott held that true communism involved the sharing of women as well as of other possessions. In the community each member had a separate room, the family meeting every day, I think twice daily, for devotions.

All matters of spiritual growth and moral development were talked over in a very personal way, something after the manner of the old Methodist class meeting. There seems to be no doubt that the members of the Community were happy, healthy and efficient. They made silverware which they sold profitably, and their work has made the foundation of a prosperous business organization, which has become widely known.

The sex life was talked of with the same frankness as all other personal problems, and recognized as having a necessary place in individual and community life. When a man member of the Community wished to visit a woman member in her room he sent a request, always through another woman member, never requesting the appointment directly from the woman he wished to meet. If the reply was favorable, the engagement was kept. It is not necessary to go into the details of the system of birth control, which was followed by the members of the Community. This mingling of the sexes was taken as a matter of course as a part of the life of friendship. If a man and a woman desired to have a child, they first secured the sanction of the group and if this was given, the child was born, and was cared for by the Community.

JOURNAL OF SEXOLOGY AND PSYCHANALYSIS

Conventional persons pretend to be, and perhaps are, very much shocked at this recital, but if they will ask themselves why they are shocked, they will find it hard to answer. This is practically the way people live in America nowadays. The only difference is that we lie about it and say that we are doing wrong, while the little group of friends in the Oneida Community told the truth about it and believed they were doing right.

It seems quite idle to say that the trend of civilization is toward monogamy. This is distinctly not the case. Its trend is in precisely the opposite direction. Nurses, physicians, officers, enlisted men, yeomen, aviators, marines, and all the rest of the battling hordes which America sent to Europe in 1917-18 came back with a perfectly new understanding of life, as they had been forced to a perfectly new understanding of death.

Here is a typical story, told, by the way, not by an American nurse, but by an English nurse who came later to America. She told of an English family, consisting of a widowed mother and four unmarried daughters, and related that before the war ended her services as midwife had been required in turn by the mother and each of the four daughters.

Not only in England where the war disorganization continued so long, nor on the continent where all life was in an uproar, but even in comparatively tranquil America the new conditions had their effect. I was told by a quiet-voiced, courteous young chap, who was busy in Washington during the war months, that the free and easy camaraderie of the men and women engaged in Government service there often expressed itself in unconventional forms. He said that many a married couple, that is, the man married and the woman married, but not to each other, left the city for a quiet week-end, coming back to their work on Monday morning unperturbed, and that hundreds of young wives and young husbands went back to their own homes at the close of the war with whimsical, happy, and untroubled recollections of those extra-marital adventures into the world of romance while the whole world was being racked with the turmoils of war.

You will ask me what I would suggest as a substitute for marriage, and I answer that clean and courageous people, in greater numbers every day, are beginning to live frankly as though there were no such institution as marriage. You understand that I am assuming that society has at least progressed so far that we all recognize the obligation of

THE CASE AGAINST MARRIAGE—NEWKIRK

being kind and helpful in all our relationships. It is quite likely true that marriage was a necessary part of the social organization in its development and progress toward freedom and efficiency. It is perhaps true that men would have learned to be kind much more quickly if it had not been for the peculiar entanglements of our economic, industrial, commercial and governmental organization. But as a matter of fact, history shows that mankind has been cruel. And under a reign of selfishness, when a man might satisfy his lust upon a woman and then leave her to bear the anguish of childbirth and the burdens of motherhood unsupported, it was necessary to attempt to hold him by some social law to do his duty. But it is a mistake to think that as liberty increases, kindness will diminish. What is likely true is that humanity is essentially kind, and that we have been forced into our cruelty by the social system imposed upon us.

But I think that, granting the single obligation to be kind, no further restraints in sex matters are necessary. If a man and woman mutually wish to enter into a sexual union, it is the concern of no one else than themselves, and to this rule it is not necessary to make any exceptions. If no children are to be desired as a result of the union, the birth of children can be prevented and society has no right to forbid this prevention. If children are desired, the man and the woman must mutually agree, either to provide for the children during their years of dependence, or to make sure that society will so provide for them.

What is likely to happen is that the monogamic home will pass away, and that we shall have instead something that may be called "living groups." Small groups of men and women of congenial tastes, interested in doing the same kind of work, will live together, perhaps in the large apartment houses that Mr. George describes. But no woman in the group will be called any man's wife, and no man will be called any woman's husband. Each individual will have a room or an apartment to himself or herself, where the individual life will be left free to develop in accordance with the individual's wishes and purposes. None of the men will feel that he is under any obligation to give an account of himself, his whereabouts, or his actions to any of the women, and none of the women will feel that she must give an account of herself to any one of the men.

This gift called freedom is not freedom unless it is continuous. Freedom that is even occasionally surrendered will soon disappear.

This method of group living will do much to put an end to the intolerable burdens that now rest upon the individual home. In present-day civilized countries, particularly since the great war, there are comparatively few families that are able either financially or physically to keep up the home.

Who can count the anxieties and distresses of the average home—the woman burdened with hideous drudgery, the man frantic under the pressure of obligations that he cannot meet, wondering from week to week whether the bills can be paid, bills for the baby's milk, bills for the fuel, bills for groceries, the nightmare of the landlord's monthly call, the still more horrid nightmare of sickness that will make it necessary for him to summon the doctor, whom he cannot hope to pay, with now and again a ghastly visit from the undertaker, who adds to the heartbreak of death the further misery of another bill that cannot be met! I do not doubt that of the thousands who read this article, all but a very few will realize that this description of the average home is either a picture of what they are going through now, or what they have endured in the not remote past.

The plan of group living will put an end to all this. There will be community buying, community cooking, community laundering, community nursing, as Mr. George so delightfully described, but I am sure that society will take the only logical step, and have communism too in its love affairs. You are shocked again and say, "This man is preaching free love." That is precisely what I am preaching, and I preach it because I believe in freedom, because I believe in love. They are the two most precious things in life.

I like to think that one of the most beautiful phases of this new epoch of genuine freedom on which the race is about to enter will be the real freedom of romance. It is terrible to think that so much of the hideous suffering of humanity has been so needless—a woman grieving her life away for love of a man to whom she dare not declare her passion, a man enduring years of forbidden sorrow because of the love for a woman which he felt was wrong to confess. All this will be changed in the new day. If any woman is conscious of a passion for any man, she will tell him so with modest gladness, and any man will be proud to confess the same to any woman.

There will still be a problem in the cases in which passion ends on one side and not on the other. But here as everywhere the law of kindness will find an answer, and the man or the woman who has come to the end of passion may find a way

of putting new and tender meanings into friendship, and there need be no such tragedies as those featured luridly in the daily press when a battered romance leads to suicide or murder. It is only because we have been falsely trained, have given false values to our experiences, we find ourselves unable to endure the wrench of a burnt-out passion.

And what of love itself? Love is a genuine thing, love with all the tender and mysterious ideals of saint and poet. Love is not passion; love survives passion; love persists even through the storms of passion that may sometimes obscure it. In our present entanglements of society the husband who has been led away from his wife by an overmastering passion, or the wife who has been led away from her husband, creeps back weeping, with penitent feet. There are reproaches, at least self-reproaches. If the love is real, there will be forgiveness. But all this is needless, and there will be smiles in the future at the tears of to-day. "Love suffereth long and is kind. Love never faileth. . . . Perfect love casteth out fear." And those who truly love defy all the storms of physical passion to destroy love.

Lastly, what of the children? They are the real monarchs of the race. All our planning must be for them. But here again we know that those who are truly free, who have developed a self-reliant, efficient personality, are best fitted to become parents. There is not space to go fully into the question of the harm done to the average child by the environment of the average home. Most homes are unhappy, most children are happier when they go visiting away from home than when they are at home. Also, most children develop more rapidly and sturdily if they are sent early away from home to work or to boarding school.

It has been said that the secret of the vigor of the governmental clique in the British Empire is the fact that its members, generation after generation, are the product of the English public schools, which correspond to the American boarding-school. Here the young scion of the influential family has learned to be self-reliant, safe from the weakening influences of his mother's tenderness and the protecting care of his father. The root of the trouble of the institution of the home is that it is a miniature monarchy. The children of each home feel that they are more important, more precious than the children of any other home. Father is king, mother is queen, and the children of all other homes are competitors and rivals. In the

new social grouping which I am venturing to predict, each child, after perhaps the first two years of special mother care, will be trained and cared for by the expert staff of nurses and teachers employed by each group.

To sum up, there are three kinds, or three phases of normal sex relationship: The lowest is that of casual sex union, such as is now indulged in surreptitiously by a large percentage of the adults, married and unmarried, in our present-day social system. This will undoubtedly continue as long as the human race exists. It will be indulged in frankly, without shame and without hypocrisy; it will probably always be accompanied by some form of birth control, and will have nothing whatever to do with the birth of children.

Second, the union which is the outcome of sex passion. These unions will in their very nature and almost invariably be temporary, and in many cases will result in the birth of children, who will be cared for first by the parents, and later by the social group. Third, the love of one man for one woman, which will always be the highest form of friendship, often untouched by passion and having only incidental connection with the birth and rearing of children.

STUTTERING AND ANAL-EROTICISM

By S. A. Tannenbaum, M. D.

The psychology of stuttering, or, rather, of the stutterer, seems to be getting a great deal more attention of late than it has in times past. This is, in all likelihood, due chiefly to the fact that stutterers have been encouraged to think or to hope that their malady too may be made to vanish by the magic of psycho-analysis. If so many other maladies which had been thought incurable prove to be psychogenetic and susceptible to the psycho-analyst's technique, why, thinks the stutterer, should not his affliction also turn out to be merely a hysterical manifestation which a competent psycho-analyst may eradicate by digging down into the Unconscious and thus liberating "hidden powers." Unfortunately, experience proves that in actual practice stuttering is no more easily curable now than it was in the past and that in this it does not differ from other severe psycho-neuroses. This statement must not, however, be interpreted to mean that some cases of stuttering and of other psycho-neuroses are not curable by psycho-analysis, or that they are less curable by psycho-analysis than by other methods (suggestion, persuasion, religious conversion, Christian Science, etc.). Increasing experience will prove that it is not the method that cures but the patient's preparedness for a cure and the personality (tactfulness, sympathy, skill and suggestive powers) of the healer.

The following translation of an abstract of a paper on "the psycho-analysis of stuttering" by R. Brun, read before the Swiss association of psycho-analysts (March 25, 1922), and published in the *Internationale Zeitschrift f. Psycho-analyse*, 1923, pp. 124-5, will, no doubt, be of interest:

"The lecturer reports two cases of severe habitual stuttering which had been thoroughly analyzed by him; he thinks that the material he elicited from his patients is calculated to throw light on the hitherto still obscure psychogenesis of this peculiar form of compulsion-hysteria. The two cases concerned boys of eighteen and of twenty, respectively, and both traced their neurosis back to their fourth year of life. The results of the analyses, as far as the causal determinants of their cardinal symptom (stuttering) are concerned, coincide very largely in both cases—these may be briefly summarized as follows:

"Both of these patients manifested a high degree of *anal eroticism* in their early childhood and had clung to this phase of their sexual development for an unusually long time and with unusual tenacity. When threats and severe punishments made the discontinuance of this wicked passion imperative, direct anal erotic activities were *repressed*; in its place, however, there appeared as a *substitute-gratification* a strikingly strong tendency to *coprolalia*, to 'talking dirty.' This tendency too became the centre of threats and punishment, and was, in turn, subjected to *repression* which, however, succeeded only *incompletely*, i. e., there now ensued the *neurotic symptom formation*, viz.: *stuttering*, which proved to be a *typical compromise between two impulses*. This process in the Unconscious may be regarded as having proceeded somewhat as follows:

1. Talking dirty is something which must be unconditionally avoided; it must be given up.

2. But inasmuch as one is never certain whether a dirty word has not unwittingly slipped out, one ought really be wholly silent (Mutism). This is not feasible. One's speech must therefore be constantly held in apprehensive check, and this constantly watchful and apprehensive tendency to caution will manifest itself whenever one is about to utter a sound or word which by its sound or sense suggests, no matter how remotely, a coprophilic complex.

3. *And third—but not last!—in the stuttering the forbidden coprolalia (and ultimately even the condemned coprophilia) gets a kind of symbolic gratification; for in the stuttering the tabooed (dirty) sound (symbolic: s--t!) is not merely taken into the mouth (in the shape of the familiar reduplications) but thoroughly rolled about in the mouth, as if it were being 'chewed.'* (Just as, furthermore, in the stutterer's familiar pressing, blowing and whistling, he gives symbolic 'expression' to the act of defecation!)

"Two other considerations seem to the lecturer to speak for the

correctness of the causal analysis he has sketched above: first, the fact that in both cases the stuttering *completely disappeared immediately* after the unveiling and disposal of the infantile anal-erotic and coprolalic experiences and fantasies; that, in other words, the cure very clearly coincided with the removal of the childhood amnesia; second, the noteworthy circumstance that after their cure both patients, in striking contrast to their former diffidence, *now developed a quite striking inclination to bold cynicism* and hence were actually feared by their comrades because of their ready wit and biting satire."

In a footnote to the final paragraph, the author says: "At the time of the lecture the second patient was again under treatment owing to a fairly severe recurrence, a recurrence which, as it turned out later, depended, in the first place, on an insufficient disposal (*ungenügende Erledigung*) of his patient's hypertrophic anal-eroticism. In the interval he has been completely cured, i. e., he has not stuttered for the past six months." (The author's italics throughout.)

That the above report, or analysis, has neither scientific nor practical value will be evident from the considerations that follow. In the first place, it is misleading, mischievously misleading, in its implication that psycho-analysis can cure all cases of stuttering. An analyst who says he treated and cured two cases of a particular malady or symptom without also saying that he treated and failed to cure others is guilty of at least dishonesty in scientific matters in that he implies that he can cure all such cases by his method of treatment. (Otherwise he should tell us that his experience is limited to these two cases.) This is especially true if, as in this instance, his "analysis" apparently confirms a theory or endorses a technique advocated by himself or another. The matter is of importance especially as regards stuttering, because several psycho-analysts (Jelliffe, Brill) are anything but hopeful when it comes to the treatment of stutterers.

When the time comes to evaluate the therapeutic efficacy of psycho-analysis as compared with other methods of treatment, it will be important to have data on how many patients were treated by this method and how many were wholly or partially cured under its influence. In the absence of such data no worthwhile conclusion can be reached.

That the above patients were "cured" is no proof whatsoever of the "correctness of the causal analysis" or of the truth of the Freudian theory as to the anal-erotic significance of stuttering. The therapeutic test is no test; if it were, we would have to ack-

knowledge the scientific character of the absurdities of Christian Science, Couéism, chiropractic, etc.

It is, to say the least, more than merely a suspicious circumstance that both patients, with the aid of the analyst, traced their stuttering back to infantile coprophilia (love of dirt). It is suspicious because that is precisely what we expect to find in the analyses of stuttering made since Freud's recent pronouncements on the subject. Before the anal-erotic theory was announced, cases of stuttering were reported cured on the basis of the Oedipus and other complexes. This is in itself sufficient to cast doubts on the correctness of the analysis or on a connection between anal-eroticism and stuttering.

That the patients were cured, as reported, is more than doubtful. Patient No. 2 returned for treatment with a fairly severe recurrence after he had been discharged "cured." If he had gone to another analyst or had taken up some other method of treatment, Mr. Brun would have reported him as cured and we should never have known differently. Temporary cures are affected by many methods of treatment but these are of absolutely no value other than as proving that the malady is psychogenetic. To believe that these patients were cured, and that they were cured by the analysis, I would have to interview them. Psycho-analytic literature is full of suspicious case reports. To prove their veracity and the correctness of their analyses, psychoanalysts, as well as other psycho-therapists, ought to be ready to present their patients before medical associations, exactly as is done by internists, surgeons, neurologists, urologists, syphilographers, etc.

The above case reports are also suspicious because the author claims that both patients were *completely* and *immediately* cured with the removal of the childhood amnesia relative to the coprolalic experience and fantasies. Miracles do not happen. Psychoanalysis is not a miracle-working magic. Even Freud now admits that analysis is only the beginning of the treatment and that a cure can be brought about only by the much more difficult task of re-education. Besides, one would like to know just how "immediately" such patients are cured. Do they begin at once to speak without any stuttering movements of the vocal apparatus? And what about the neurosis itself of which the stuttering is only one manifestation? Is the whole neurosis cured at one stroke, immediately? Does the neurotic patient at once become a normal healthy human being? I do not believe it.

The author speaks of "uncovering and disposing of the in-

fantile anal-erotic experiences and fantasies." In this there is a "joker." How are such experiences and fantasies "disposed of?" Are they "disposed of" at one session so that the patient may be cured "immediately?" If to "dispose of" these fantasies means to alter the patient's attitude or (and) to change his desires, this cannot be done immediately. To re-condition one's desires is to change one's character—a transformation which cannot take place immediately.

Besides, Brun contradicts himself when he says that the symptoms disappeared after "the unveiling and disposal" of the infantile fantasies and makes this synonymous with the "removal of the childhood amnesia." Removing the amnesia, i. e., bringing back the forgotten memories, is not the same thing as "disposing" of these memories. Just how a remembered fantasy is disposed of and how that cures are important matters about which we want to know a great deal more than our author tells us and about which prospective patients have a right to be informed.

It is amusing, if not pathetic, to read that Patient No. 2 had a recurrence because he had a hypertrophied anal-eroticism. But the analyst did not discover the hypertrophy until after the recurrence. To us it seems as if the "hypertrophy" was invented by the analyst to excuse his failure to cure his patient in the first place. And that's one of the important troubles with psychoanalysis: the analyst is never wrong; he is an unerring god; if the patient is not cured it's always the patient's fault.

What, we might ask by the way, are the indications of a hypertrophied anal-eroticism?

Brun analyzed his patients "thoroughly"; but he tells us nothing about their other complexes. Didn't they have any others? What role did *they* play in causing the neurosis? How does he know that some of them did not contribute to the stammering neurosis, e. g., a repressed and re-emerging desire to chew the mother's breast or the pacifier or the rubber nipple of the bottle that was given them? How does he know that anal-eroticism had anything to do with the development of the stuttering? (The pacifier or the nipple might have been dirty and thus caused an interest in dirt. Besides, the odor and taste of rubber might very well be associated with "dirt," if the analyst must have dirt in his analyses.) How does he know that the stuttering disappeared with the exposure of the anal-erotic fantasies and not with the exposure of some of the other tabooed fantasies?

We are told that the patients manifested a high degree of anal-eroticism in early childhood. How high a degree? All

of us are credited with a high degree of anal-eroticism by the psycho-analysts (Note the universal interest in money and possessions!); then why do we not all become stutterers? Why did they have a high degree of anal-eroticism? Why didn't they succeed in repressing it as completely as others do? Why did the repressed matter return in them if it does not return in most of the rest of us?

If there is any truth in the anal-erotic theory of stuttering, we want to know why it is that not all endowed with anal-eroticism become stutterers, and why some children who are not more interested in their stools and in defecation than seems normal do become stutterers. We know stutterers who haven't any of the so-called anal-erotic traits of character (excessive neatness, stinginess, etc.) in a higher degree than is met with in non-stutterers.

To say that the stutterer acts as if he were rolling faeces about in his mouth, and even chewing it, is no doubt exquisitely scientific, but it isn't true. The stutterer's mouth and lip movements are nothing like the action of chewing or of rolling something about in the mouth. The imagination which discovers a resemblance between the spasmodic action of the stutterer's mouth muscles and the act of defecation cannot but arouse the keenest admiration. If there is any connection between stuttering and giving "expression" (!) to ideas, we should all be stutterers and the worst stutterers should prove the most expressive. If the punning reference to "expression"—so characteristic of the psycho-analytic method—is intended as an argument, it is a very bad one; if it was indulged in merely as a pun it is in very bad taste. Incidentally it may be pointed out herewith that from our use of the word "taste" in the last sentence it might be argued, psycho-analytically, that all art expression and appreciation emanate from mouth-eroticism, i. e., from the child's inherited taste for its mother's milk. (The milk too has to be "expressed"—from the mother's breast and from the farm.)

There is not the slightest particle of truth in Brun's statement that the stutterer's difficulties are set in "motion" (!) "whenever he is about to utter a sound or word which by its sound or sense suggests, *no matter how remotely*, a coprophilic complex." Anyone who has had even the slightest open-eyed experience with stutterers knows that though certain sounds are more apt to cause them difficulties than others, they are very often capable of uttering these sounds fluently and with

perfect ease. "Dirty words" give them no more trouble than others. At other times even the most innocent words and words which they expect to say without any difficulty whatsoever, offer them insurmountable obstacles. If Brun's statement were true, stutterers would never be able to say anything for there is hardly a word in the language whose sound or meaning cannot be proved to touch on a coprophilic complex if one cares to take advantage of the author's "no matter how remotely."

The truth about stuttering, or, at least, a large part of the truth, is that the stutterer's whole character is at fault, that he suffers from an overwhelming sense of inferiority (which contributes to and is contributed to by his speech defect), that largely because of this sense of inferiority he is rarely at his ease when engaged in conversation, and that when he is so engaged he bungles up his speech because he is thinking not merely of what he is saying but whether he is saying it correctly, expressively, fittingly, adequately, and what his audience is thinking of him. When he is so interested in what he is saying that nothing but its expression matters he does not stutter.

That stuttering can be cured and often cures itself (by a change in the stutterer's circumstances, his environment, his fortunes, his education, his morals, etc.) cannot be doubted. That the stutterer can be cured also admits of no doubt but it takes a long time and involves the building up of his character, not the unveiling of his complexes.

ABSTRACTS

SHOE FETICHISM

"In discussing shoe fetichism," says Aigremont in his booklet on foot and shoe symbolism and eroticism, "we cannot wholly disregard these factors, [namely, that the shoe is a hollow object into which the foot (phallus) is inserted, and that the shoe has an odor reminiscent of the foetor cunni]. Kind is probably right in his observation (*Jahrbuch f. sex. Zwischenstufen*, vol. 9: "Ueber die Komplikationen der Homosexualität.") that the genuine shoe fetichist tries to get possession of a boot and treats it (strokes it, fondles it, ejaculates into it) exactly as if he had the wearer before him, i. e., the fetich is never really regarded as a lifeless object and that to the fetichist the desired person is always present in his mind's eye. But we must, nevertheless, not lose sight of the fact that the shoe fetichist's whole deportment shows that at the bottom of his behavior is the dim and ancient conception of the boot as a sexual symbol, that the boot reminds him of another owner of a penis. That is why a genuine shoe fetichist is not stirred up by a naked female foot. In a male homosexual fetichist the fantasy changes to one of pederasty.

"Other factors, e. g., the form, style and color of the footwear, contribute to augment the sexual value of the object to the shoe fetichist. The ladies' boots (shoes, slippers) must be narrow, small, neat. In these cases a sadistic element also enters into the matter, as in cases of tight corset fetichism, tight glove fetichism, etc. Or the boots must have a double row of buttons or must be buttoned high up. Above all, the footwear must have high heels; in that case the woman's walk is even more exciting—her walk is then correct, proud, domineering or wanton (if she swings her gluteal region from side to side); to others her walk seems then more esthetic, refined, less energetic, sylph-like, and she is purer and cleaner because the high

ABSTRACTS

heels elevate her from the dirty earth. Others say that wearing high heels makes the lower part of the leg and of the foot esthetically nicer. [The mincing step of those wearing high heels is, to many, a leisure class symbol, suggestive of idleness and refinement. To some these shoes and this gait suggest the demi-monde, to others innocence, sexual inexperience. To most people they suggest only femininity.] Retif de la Bretonne [who was the first to describe shoe fetichism and to dwell on it in fiction] advises women to wear very high heels and thus help to keep men from developing homosexual tendencies. Kind is probably right in thinking that to men to whom ladies' shoes are a fetich high heels are especially suggestive of such shoes. Apart from the difference in size, an officer's boots differ from those of a woman in that the former has a high shaft and the latter a high heel. The fetichists feel these characteristic differences instinctively.

"The color of boots is not a matter of indifference. In a novel called "Priesterinnen der Freude" [Priestesses of Joy] three girls are described who were very exciting because their legs and feet were dressed in white open-worked silk stockings and red Atlas-shoes. Of late yellow, [blue, green, red, white, tan, brown] shoes are affected by women of all classes.

"Shoe fetichists are not indifferent to the ladies' stockings, their color, the material they are made of, etc. Some must have them of silk, and some must have them white, or black, or red. [Cotton and woollen stockings are much less attractive to men than silk stockings—the latter not only show the shape of the leg better but suggest smoothness, firmness and cleanliness.] Some love the stocking to reach up to the knee, others above the knee and others all the way up the thigh. Some fetichists insist on open-work stockings which show the skin; in these cases black silk stockings are the favorites. Others demand stockings that have lace insertions, a blood-red garter on a white stocking, or a white garter on a black stocking. Strindberg (*The Confessions of a Fool*) describes his discovery that a lady who had raised her dress had a graceful leg tightly clasped in a white stocking and encircled below the knee by a gay-colored garter."

"Genuine shoe-fetichism always gives the impression of a hetero-sexual or homosexual tendency (Kind, l. c.). Genuine congenital [?] homosexuals who are nauseated or actually disgusted by women like heavy masculine boots with high shafts.

"In shoe-fetichists who like to be trodden on and kicked by persons wearing shoes [or boots] the main source of pleasure

lies in the masochistic idea of being abused and ill-used by the beloved male or female rather than in thoughts of the boot. These 'boot worshippers' do not need to think of 'immissio penis in vaginam' (Cf. Moll, *Libido Sexualis*, No. 36); that is why some get greatly excited when they are kicked [or stepped on] by the naked foot of a woman. The main source of their ecstasy lies in the thought of their dog-like humility, irrespective of whether the humiliation is the work of the feet, the fists or the hands of the female. [To a large extent this is also true of cunnilingus, fellatorism, etc.] The boot worshipper's greatest delight is in lying on the ground and being trodden on by a girl clad in elegant boots, and the pleasure increases in proportion to the girl's pride and haughtiness and to the force and painfulness of her steps or kicks.

"The motive of the neat little boot or slipper, which plays a great role in fetichists, was known even in antiquity. Omphale, the Queen of the Lydians, struck Heracles with her neat golden slipper; and we find a hint of the 'Cinderella motive' in the story of the Egyptian Queen Nitagrit (Nitokris), 'the rosy-cheeked beauty,' the loveliness of the unknown love who dwells in humble station is known from her neat and graceful shoe. And we are all familiar with the German fairy tale of Cinderella. . . . In the *Pentameron* the collier girl Zezolla acquires rich garments and jewels from the dove of the fairies. She dances unrecognized with the Prince. The last time that she does so she throws her slipper behind her and is recognized through it. Another variation of this old fairy tale is the Swedish tale of 'The Little Gold Shoe' by Turley: a green pike presents the Cinderella with magnificent garments. She dances with the Prince. The little golden shoe sticks to the tar with which the Prince had painted the threshold of the church door, and in this way the beloved maid is recognized. In the French fairy tale (as written by Perrault) Cendrillon loses a tiny little glass shoe. In Zingerle's fairy tale, *The Three Sisters*, it is not the third and good sister who has the smallest foot, but the middle one who deceitfully pads the shoe with some rags. This is a later variation and is probably intended to express the idea that too large is just as bad as too small and that the good lies in the happy mean. This widely distributed fairy tale material shows that the enticing little shoe or slipper has been regarded as a conscious badge of beauty by very different kinds of people. This motive may originally have had a different meaning. Gubernatis (*Animals in Indo-Germanic Mythology*) says: the word

ABSTRACTS

'Apad' may mean not only she who has no feet but also she who leaves no footprints behind, or she who has no shoes. The dawn has in all likelihood lost these, for, when Prince Mitra follows the beautiful maiden, he finds a slipper which shows her footprint and the measure of her foot—such a small foot as no other woman has, a foot so small that it is scarcely observable."

Iwan Bloch (*Das Sexualleben unserer Zeit*, 1909, pp. 689-90), discussing this subject, says that shoe-fetichism—or "Retifism," as he calls it—is by far the most common variety of clothing fetichism. Retif de la Bretonne (1734-1806) manifested this perversion as early as his tenth year, as he tells us in his celebrated autobiography, *Monsieur Nicolas* (vol. 1, pp. 90-93). He says:

"Has this preference for beautiful feet (which is so strong in me that it never fails to arouse my strongest desires and which causes me to disregard the owner's ugliness of shape and features) its cause in a physical or a mental peculiarity of my nature? This preference is very strong in all those who are so endowed. Has it anything to do with a preference for a light step, a graceful or sensual dancing movement? The remarkable attraction which is exerted by footgear is surely only the reflex of the liking for beautiful feet which entice even animals. The covering is valued as highly as the foot itself. The passion that I cherish since my childhood was an inherited tendency which depended on a natural preference. But the preference for a small foot has a physical basis which is betrayed in the Latin saying: 'Parvus pes, barathrum grande.'

"Retif presents a typical case of shoe fetichism. He trembled with pleasurable excitement at the sight of women's shoes and blushed in their presence as he would have done in the presence of girls; he collected the slippers and shoes of the women he loved, kissed them, smelled them, and occasionally insemminated them. He was especially fascinated by high heels on women's shoes, and their sight put him into great sexual excitement.

"That shoe-fetichism existed even in antiquity and that a relationship was supposed to exist between the foot and the *vita sexualis*, I have shown in my *Aetiologie der Psychopathia sexualis*, vol. 2, pp. 323-5. In modern shoe-fetichism, masochistic and sadistic ideas (of being stepped on, of having another's foot on one's neck, of stepping on another's foot, hand, etc.) play a role, as well as the odor of the leather and the color of the

shoes. 'Foot worshippers' differ greatly among themselves as to the style and kind of shoe they prefer. One loves ladies boots, another riding boots, a third dance shoes, a fourth slippers, a fifth heavy peasant shoes, etc. Tastes also differ as to the ornamentation, the color, the kind of heels, etc. A priest whom I knew was a heel fetichist; Hirschfeld mentions (*Vom Wesen der Liebe*, p. 148) a man who was sexually excited only by the creases in shoes, and a woman who raved about men's dusty boots. P. Näcke reports a case of shoe-fetichism in the *Bulletin de la societe de medecine mentale de Belgique*, 1894. Charcot mentions a case in which the fetich was not a shoe but the nails in the sole of a woman's shoe.

Bloch speaks of a Madame Tarnowsky who played a role in the sensational murder (Sept., 1907) of Count Komarowsky. She evidently figured on the appetites of shoe-fetichists, for in a very short time she ordered twenty pairs of the most elegant shoes and a pair of the finest silk stockings to match the shoes in color; on her ankles she wore heavy gold chain bands, and each one of her many costly morning costumes had its special pair of costly and made to order slippers.

"Isolated foot-fetichism occurs but rarely, most frequently it is combined with shoe-fetichism which is rather common."

The psychology, significance and genesis of fetichism we shall discuss on another occasion. For a complete presentation of the subject the reader is referred to Dr. W. Stekel's book *Der Fetichismus* (Berlin and Vienna, 1923).

S. A. T.

ABSTRACTS

MORE ABOUT RIGHT AND LEFT

The following comments supplement what I said about the symbolism of right and left in No. 2 of this Journal (p. 195).

Dr. O. A. Wall (*Sex and Sex Worship*, St. Louis, 1918, p. 144) refers to the post-Pythagorean philosophers, Thessalus, Drakon, Polybius, etc., "who believed . . . that the male 'seeds' were formed in the right testicle and the female 'seeds' were formed in the left testicle; they believed the sex of the offspring could be controlled by tying a string around one of the testicles during coition. A string tied around the right testicle prevented the male seeds from escaping, so that a seed from the left testicle would produce a girl child; and *vice versa*, by tying a string around the left testicle and allowing only seed from the right testicle to be emitted, a boy must necessarily be the result. Galen (130-200 A. D.) also taught this theory." [If the trick failed, "the string had not been tied tight enough."]

"The Kabbalah considered the right side of the body to be male and the left side to be female."

At one time, prior to Soranus (97 A. D.), a belief was current that "the womb was made of lobes, called by some ancient writers 'the harbors of Venus,' the one on the right side being warm, so that seed which lodged there became developed into male children, while the one on the left side was cold and wet, so that seed finding its way to this harbor developed female children." Another theory had it that a child which was attached to a placenta on the right side of the uterus became a male, whereas one attached to one on the left side became a female.

According to the *Kabbalah*, a Jewish system of theosophy or philosophy which incorporates many ancient Jewish traditions—I am quoting Wall (l. c., p. 194)—the "Holy Ghost made all things male and female, because otherwise nothing could endure [According to it] wisdom was located in the forehead and was male, while intelligence was located in the left side of the chest and was female; . . . love was male and was in the right arm, justice [!] was female and resided in the left arm, and together they produced beauty (which resided) in the bosom or breasts. Firmness was male and resided in the right thigh; splendor was female and resided in the left thigh, and together they produced 'foundation' or sex [sexual organs]."

Artemidoros thought that in dreams the right side signifies one's father, son, friend, or anyone who is regarded as one's

"right hand," and that the left indicates one's mother, sister, daughter, or slave.

Graphologists warn us against people who write to the left, i. e., a back-hand; they say that such persons are evil-minded and should not be trusted. Artemidoros was quite sure that to dream of writing a back-hand means that one is engaged in doing something wicked, crooked, dishonorable, treacherous, or taking unfair advantage of somebody, or that the dreamer will commit adultery and bring bastards into the world. But he admits that he knew a man who, after such a dream, did nothing more heinous than write humorous songs.

In connection with what we said about the opposition being always on the left of the speaker, it is interesting to note that in demonology the Devil is almost invariably located at the northern extremity of the earth and that therefore perhaps in old cathedrals the north is always to the left.

From all that we have said it is easily apparent why a witness taking an oath is required to raise the right hand heavenward.

S. A. T.

ABSTRACTS

EXCESSIVE COITION

Dr. J. Rutgers (*Das Sexualleben in seiner biologischen Bedeutung*, 1922, No. 6) marvels at the zeal with which moralists decry excesses in sexual intercourse, though he never heard them raising their voices against excessive continence. The Gods of Olympus also begrudged the happiness of human beings, and we may be certain that the moralizers would exhort people to give themselves up whole-heartedly to sexual intercourse if the latter was something disagreeable and painful.

Especially from pulpits do we hear vehement fulminations against immoderate passion, against bathing in the waters of voluptuousness—and all this in a world where everybody is longing for a little more love, a little more tenderness, a little more happiness.

Behold that young man, who has fallen a victim to masturbation. Is his a case of excess? No, it is poverty, privation. He would have preferred a merry engagement with the prospect of a happy married life. Behold those men, living in furnished rooms, and from sheer despair seeking consolation in booze and in the arms of *venus vulgivaga*.

Can we speak of immoderation in such cases? No, they represent the complete absence of the happiness of love. Oh, why should so many well-made bodies, and so many loving souls, be for ever deprived of life's greatest happiness!

And what about all those married persons—their number is legion—who, though practising sexual intercourse regularly, have not found congenial mates, in soul and body suited one to the other? They are starving, though not for lack of food, but because the food offered to them is indigestible.

There certainly are persons who overestimate their senses, and excess in this regard is harmful, as it is in everything else, and it is useful to point this out, though we never should generalize.

Many a physician may have observed a few instances of marital or extramarital sexual excesses, but in the majority of cases he sees just the opposite, namely, a deficiency, and very rarely an abundance of love and joyfulness.

There is often to be observed a squandering of vital energy, but this does not mean excess, for, indeed, it is nothing but a wrong application, an abuse, as is to be seen especially in premature stimulation of the senses, or where an artificial excitation of the sexual impulse takes place.

Fortunately, here as everywhere, nature is the best teacher:

healthy, vigorous, joyful persons will not so easily fall a prey to morbid reveries. And immoderation will soon be checked by fatigue and exhaustion, every vital function being restricted within its possible limits.

If the moralizers wanted really to do something useful, they would help us in our search for the optimum, instead of continually preaching the minimum. Indeed, mankind would present a melancholy sight if we all should become "minimal men."

For the present and for some time to come, little good is to be expected from the professional moralists. They still hark back to a time when mankind was powerless in the face of overfecundity and venereal diseases, and, consequently, the preaching of sexual continence was justified. But since then things have changed. Nevertheless, with a view of buttressing their archaic doctrines, the moralizers desperately fight against all hygienic measures and practical counsels by the application of which the present state of affairs could be improved. Human happiness, the future of the race, must be mercilessly sacrificed to the superannuated doctrines of those fanatics, and thus the grossest immorality is praised as moral conduct, and even the very concept of morality is being discredited in public opinion.

There are indeed cases of married people who learn from experience that moderation and self-control is more beneficial than a too frequent yielding.

Besides these, there are not a few persons who under the influence of some constitutional weakness, such as heart-troubles, the tendency to fainting spells, etc., know how to subordinate their libido to other interests. For as soon as the stimulus exceeds a certain limit and excitation becomes too violent, they feel utterly exhausted. They then take the resolution not to let passion run away with them again, and they may even feel proud of their determination and try to impose their own resolutions upon others. For such persons even the slightest yielding means already an excess.

Quite different is the married life of vigorous, healthy persons. Instead of giving themselves up to brooding, instead of tormenting themselves, they serenely perform their daily tasks. Rest and exertion alternate in the even course of their life, which is not troubled by any nervous exhaustion. Occasionally, according to the demands of their age, their affection and sexual constellation, they will consummate the most intimate aim of their married life, and this every time means to them a reconfirmation of their union: the act of copulation is the realization of their nuptial vow to make one another happy.

ABSTRACTS

Such persons are proud of it, and would feel ashamed if in solitude they had to stifle their passion, for this would appear to them abnormal and disingenuous.

The writer once heard a young married woman exclaiming, after she had listened to a sermon in which the preacher extolled continence as the highest ideal: "how indecent!" Her purest feelings had been outraged.

For normal men and women, living natural lives, there is no occasion to go to extremes. The physiological stimulus, well directed, does never lead to hypererethism, but morbid deviations will, and of all aberrations none is more predisposing to hypererethism than enforced continence.

In such cases, passion is bound to become a compulsion neurosis, and if such persons yield only once, then they will throw overboard all restraints, giving themselves up to the wildest dissipation.

This is the spectre of immoderation, continually hovering before the eyes of the moralists, though the phantom exists nowhere but in their own imagination which has become overheated by an unnatural continence.

The sexual urge, viewed physiologically, is a natural necessity, just like all the other physical functions. One should learn to control one's reflexes, but one should not willfully, unnecessarily, suppress them. By the barometer of blood-pressure and the pulse-beats Nature reveals to us her laws.

In the bridal night a certain reserve is indicated, and later, during the honeymoon, a little more yielding is commendable, for one has to adapt oneself to the new life. For a married couple, at the acme of life, once a day would be too much, while once every other day may be recommended as the wise middle course.

In the course of time, experience will teach how to distinguish between excess and moderation. Luther, allegedly, gave the classical counsel, "twice a week." Later in life, for a married couple once a week will be enough, till, with the advent of old age, desire will fade away by itself.

If one lives thus, in conformity with the laws of Nature, the union will rest on a solid foundation and remain harmonious.

The writer once was told by a married lady, "every day, when sitting down for dinner, we are in a festive mood."

Thus, also the physical part of married life, instead of being a dull, insipid routine, should evermore become the occasion of a joyful celebration.

SUBLIMATION

What does it mean, this word Sublimation, idolized by moralists, as if it were a charm to cure all ills that flesh is heir to? Dr. J. Rutgers (*Das Sexualleben in seiner biologischen Bedeutung*, 1922, No. vi., ch. 67) tells us that it is a metaphor, borrowed from chemistry. There are substances, such as camphor, which by heat are converted from a solid into a gaseous state (sublimate).

Thus, the moralists demand, the sexual impulse should be transferred into higher, non-sexual channels, and libido be converted into celestial desire.

But we do want to make a reality of love in its highest beauty, and, step by step, to lead it up to the summit of the sublimest ideal.

To use another illustration, there are people who heartlessly blind a finch that it might sing finer, but we prefer to hear it sing from sheer joy of heart, tho less artistically.

It is a matter of observation that in consequence of long continued sexual continence, men or women, arrived at the acme of life, feel depressed, unhappy. But often also those who victoriously battled against their passions, are full of sorrows and bitterly complain, because something is wrong with them, due to a mental kink, a certain inadequacy, a strained attitude toward life's problems.

For instance, a girl not longer very young, who was so often disillusioned that she finally renounced everything. Tho sexual life once appeared full of charms to her and pregnant with promises, libido gave her nothing but sleepless nights and bitter disappointments. Now she is sick and tired of it. She neither can nor wants to harbor hopes—all things relating to sex being nauseous to her. In the future, she thinks, she will behave more sensibly, and she now tries to find consolation in something higher, and, believing in the sufficiency of her strength, she attempts to detect new ways.

She is well endowed, has talent for music, an interest for the study of theosophy, for mystic lore. She feels herself elevated to higher, to spiritual regions, without discord, fear, regret. She is conscious of her sympathy with others, with congenial souls. Of new ideals she takes hold with a strong passion burning in her breast, for, indeed, in her innermost being, passion is not extinguished, but only sublimated, transferred into higher channels. If she was really dead for the world, her devotion would take a smoother course, showing more of that

ABSTRACTS

serene calm sometimes observed in people well advanced in years.

Now, at last, having renounced the things of this world, she has found the higher life. Youth's fire, once consuming her, has become purified, sublimated.

This, perhaps, has saved her (unless, as often happens, her sublimation has become so refined that, unconsciously and against her will, she now forgets herself and sinks to the lowest depths of moral degradation, for one ecstasy is so easily converted into another).

She now feels assured of herself and rises ever higher, leaving behind all vulgar, earthly things.

Lucky for her, perhaps, but certainly not lucky for the art, the science, the high aims to which she has attached herself. What now she accomplishes and eases her sore soul, will later be presented to other, to youthful, vigorous, uncorrupted persons, for whom reality should be life's aim. And for these her gifts may prove pernicious. What helps the sick is often poison to the healthy.

She, rescued from life's shipwreck, has lost her psychic balance; the harmony between soul and body being disturbed, her productions will bear the stamp of a diseased mind.

This explains the enormous amount of morbidity in literature and art, of perversity in science. All those men and women, with their devotion and talents, would have produced better, healthier things if their hearts' innermost cravings had been requited.

How many budding, promising lives have been stunted, crippled, by sexual sickness!

And yet, many feel even proud of their perversity, as if, forsooth, this were the apex of sublimity.

Art and sex are closely linked together—both being so intuitive, so impulsive, so boundless, so disinclined to heed reason's counsel. Art and love have run the gamut of fate's vicissitudes. In despotic times, art and love, in roguish fashion, always contrived escape.

Hopeful love and boundless passion have found expression in art, but also unrequited love, pining desire, the renunciation of all earthly bliss, have impressed their stamp upon art.

In sacred literature, the evolution of the human heart is limned in similar fashion. The most ancient documents of higher life we find in the book of Genesis. Here, everything is realistic, and sex, as the foundation of the family, still held

in high esteem. There, everything, good as well as evil, is frankly appreciated and represented.

Now behold the last link in the chain of sacred writings: the adoration of the Holy Mother of God! All things suggestive of sex are swept away, only celestial bliss radiating from the transfigured face. A woman, yea, a mother, but without anything intimating sex! Here, mystic, sublimated love receives the nuptial crown. Oh, the quivering rapture of unconscious voluptuousness with which in medieval times sincere monks, emaciated from fasting and contrition, have implored the Blessed Virgin. And all those nuns, pale, spiritualized, with ardor praying to the Son of God, their Heavenly Bridegroom! Alas, let us not ask through what hell of torment they have passed before their sublimation was so far completed that with heart and soul they were ready to bid farewell to all things beauteous and charming life holds in its generous hands.

The Middle Ages were sick to the core. The Hollanders and Flamingoes, after having thrown off the fanatic Spanish yoke, were the first to show again in their pictorial art, life as it is with all its natural charms and joys.

But we of to-day are still threatened by the same danger, and with sad eyes we must see a tendency to imitate, to reproduce the past, instead of seeking the ideal in the future.

And what takes place in art, we also observe in science and philosophy. Our world conception as well as our sex life is still in the thrall of dualistic views: matter despised, instead of being accepted as the soil in which all higher things are rooted.

As in art the sublimation of sex has led to mysticism, so in philosophy it paved the way to dualism, thus disrupting the intimate bond connecting the high and the low. Pulled out of its native soil, the sublime is bound to wither, die.

The dualism of primitive peoples with their oneiromancy, their animism, and their hosts of evil spirits, was merely the manifestation of a naive noncomprehension, while the later dualism of classic times already had a deeper grounding in the antagonism called forth by divergent social, economic conditions.

In Buddhism this phenomenon represented a reaction against the luxurious court-life; in Plato's teachings, dualism sprang from the fact that he was the philosopher of a slave-state. But it was left to medieval asceticism with its monasteries, its vows of celibacy, to fashion, out of the dualistic theory, that dismal monster which like lead weighs upon men's souls.

ABSTRACTS

Only in the measure in which we succeed to free ourselves from this oppressive, baneful curse, may we attain a unifying world conception that will restore harmony between man's body and soul.

HEBBEL ON DREAMS

That the poet Hebbel thought a great deal about dreams and had a fairly good understanding of them is shown by the following quotations from his diary:

"A human being who could resolve to write out all his dreams, without any reservations, without any discriminative considerations, with absolute fidelity and circumstantiality, and who would supplement this with a commentary embracing everything that he remembered from his own experiences and from what he had read, thus explaining his dreams, such a person would present humanity with a valuable gift.

"I believe that dreams never enter the realm of consciousness in their purity, because either they do not fit into consciousness or because the act of waking contributes a foreign constituent to them which completely changes them.

"It has often seemed to me as if in a dream my soul made use of a different bulk and weight and thus altered the significance of things; it works in the old manner but not merely with other materials and elements, but also, if the expression is permissible, by another method. Obstacles with which we dare not wage war in our waking thoughts, vanish in dreams in the air we expire; trivialities which we would not deign to notice in our waking state engage all our energies in our dreams."

THE ATTITUDE OF CHRISTIANITY TOWARDS SEX

J. F. Nisbet (*Marriage and Heredity*) points to the attitude maintained by the Church towards marriage during the first ten centuries of the Christian era as one of the most painful spectacles in history. For several centuries after Christ, marriage was regarded as a purely civil contract. It was bitterly assailed in that form by the fathers of the Church, and there was a particularly nauseous element in the reforming zeal of these holy men. Chastity was preached not because it was a good thing in itself, but because man's fall and the necessity for his redemption were traced to an indiscretion committed in the Garden of Eden. The polluting influence of passion was not thought to be redeemed by marriage. All intercourse between the sexes was discountenanced. Continence was declared to be the perfection of life. The writer notes that in the course of these many centuries the Christian Doctrines of purity have practically implanted a new instinct in our nature. For the conviction entertained in Christian communities as to passion being an unholy thing is now nothing less than an instinct, and one that has shaped our entire social life. Outside certain schools of philosophy, such notions of purity as now prevail were unknown to the ancients. Nor do they obtain among nations who have never come under the sway of Christianity. The writer suggests that it would surely be difficult to maintain upon strictly philosophical grounds that an instinct or an appetite upon which the very existence of the human race depends is essentially a degraded one. As well stigmatise eating and sleeping as shameful indulgences.

ABSTRACTS

THE COMING FUSION OF ALL RACES OF MAN INTO ONE

In an article on Evolution and Man (*Jour. of Heredity*). Maynard M. Metcalfe, pointing to the important part isolation has had in human evolution, declares that the development during the last half million years of so many races of men, some now extinct, some persistent as relatively pure stocks, others intermingled, has indeed been possible only through this factor. The author shows how the spread of man over the whole of the habitable earth and the development of communication are destroying isolation and removing it as an influence in the evolution of man, and that we are approaching the time when every man may fairly be called every other man's neighbor. Intermingling of the peoples thru travel, and that breaking down of social bars which always results from the growth of cosmopolitanism, are rapidly reducing the hindrance to amalgamation of the races which existed during the now passing age of relative isolation. It seems clear that there is destined to be but one race of mankind in time, a highly hybrid stock to which all of the present races which are able to persist shall make their contribution. The author points out how both processes, extinction and fusion, have been taking place in America's short history, and with such rapidity that they can actually be observed. The unplastic Indian of the East and of the great plains, and the still more conservative Pueblo Indian of the dry country of the Southwest, are disappearing and seem destined to extinction. The negro, on the other hand, is increasing and is rapidly being whitened in spite of strong distaste on the part of the white race to intermarriage and the enactment of stringent laws against such intermarriage. A still better example of the impotence of social ostracism to stay the process of racial fusion is furnished by the Jew, whose blood is strongly infused into all the major nations of the Occident. The Syrian Jew is plainly a Syrian, the German Jew largely a Teuton, the Spanish Jew has absorbed many Spanish characters. Each of these Jews resembles his local neighbor more than he resembles his brother Jew of another country, and this social fusion has come about in spite of a social ostracism of centuries more rigorous than we of to-day can adequately conceive. Given racial contacts, even the illegitimate unions, it seems, must be sufficient in time to cause fusion of all races into one. . . . The amalgamation of the races of man into one race about as homogeneous as the present European population will doubtless take a few thousand

years to accomplish, but, so far as we can judge from the conditions now existing and those seemingly necessarily about to come, such union of the races seems inevitable. And it has one feature of great advantage: it will give in the resultant race a great variety and diversity of unit qualities to be manipulated in eugenic marriage. The greater the range of qualities the greater the possibilities for good and evil. (*Jour. Hered.*, Aug., 1916, page 357.)

ABSTRACTS

DIVORCE AND THE CHILD

. . . A house which is no longer a home in the true sense is not a fit place in which to rear a child, and there does not seem to be any good reason why adequate provision may not be made, and better provision for that, for the care of the child without keeping the parents forcibly together. To insist that the parents make reasonable and proper provision for the care of the child is a proper function of the State thru its judicial authority. . . . The whole marriage situation needs recasting and divorce should represent in its greater freedom a larger personal liberty, not a liberty that makes for license, but a liberty that is as great as is consistent with the largest opportunity for personal expression and so will tend to rob license of its excuse.—Dr. William A. White.

DEGENERATE FAMILIES

All individuals in civilized society are, to some degree, degenerates: thru a weak and vicious ancestry, the seeds of degeneracy have been scattered broadcast and may, anywhere, develop into the rankest luxuriance; but, as a rule, it is along special family lines that we find the notable phenomenon of degeneration. In these families we observe a remarkable frequency of grim morbid conditions: insanity, idiocy, eccentricity, hysteria, epilepsy, the alcohol habit, the morphine habit, neuralgia, "nervousness," St. Vitus dance, infantile convulsions, stammering, squint, gout, articular rheumatism, diabetes, tuberculosis, cancer, deafness, blindness, deafmutism, color blindness, and a number of other abnormal conditions. . . . In these same families, too, we find an extraordinary abundance of physical malformations: marked asymmetry of head and face, defects and deformities of eyes, ears, nose, mouth, forehead and chin, of teeth, jaws, and palate, of the trunk, and of the limbs. The history of these families shows an accelerating intensification, generation after generation, of the fatal heritage until they have become extinct; but during their degenerate period, the members of these sick families, serving as morbidic agents, have distributed among the race a widespread infection.—Dr. W. Duncan McKim: *Heredity and Human Progress*.

[The picture is a true one, only the colors have been put on too thick.]

THE DYSGENIC RESULTS OF ENFORCED CELIBACY
IN EUROPE

"The long period of the dark ages under which Europe has lain is due, I believe, in a very considerable degree, to the celibacy enjoined by religious orders on their votaries. Whenever a man or woman was possessed of a gentle nature that fitted him or her to deeds of charity, to meditation, to literature, or to art, the social condition of the time was such that they had no refuge elsewhere than in the bosom of the Church. But the Church chose to preach and exact celibacy. The consequence was that these gentle natures had no continuance, and thus, by a singularly unwise and suicidal policy the Church brutalized the breed of our forefathers. She acted precisely as if she had aimed at selecting the rudest portion of the community to be, alone, the parents of future generations. She practised the arts which breeders would use, who aimed at creating ferocious, currish and stupid natures. No wonder that club law prevailed for centuries over Europe; the wonder rather is that enough good remained in the veins of Europeans to enable their race to rise to its present very moderate level of natural morality." (This was written before 1914!)—Francis Galton: *Hereditary Genius*.

FECUNDAL SELECTION IN HUMAN RACES

One of the most striking examples of the loss of fertility, and of the gradual extinction that follows, is found in the experience of the Polynesians since their contact with Europeans. In but few of the islands of the Pacific have the aborigines been displaced by conflict of arms as by industrial competition. The great cause of their disappearance, during the earlier periods of intercourse was their inability to cope with the microbes of measles, smallpox, leprosy, and other diseases, unknown to them before the arrival of Europeans and Chinese. But in many groups of the islands, and especially in Hawaii, that stage of disadvantage is now largely past, thru the protection gained from Western science. Still the steady decrease in numbers continues, for the birthrate is not sufficient to meet the natural rate of mortality. And there is no reason to attribute this small birthrate to poverty or to prudential selection. Whatever the antecedent causes may have been, the present condition is failure to meet the demands of fecundal selection. The nature of the deficiency is more fully realized when the *decrease* of the Polynesian race in the original home is compared with the *increase* of the African race in North and South America.—John T. Gulick: *Evolution, Racial and Habitudinal*.

DELECTATIO AMOROSA

This is a term used by theologians in the past to designate the voluntary contemplation of voluptuous thoughts or emotions. It does not mean an active conjuring up of sexual desire but the mere passive dallying with voluptuous thoughts, as when the mind is allowed to roam lazily wherever it will. Aquinas and other medieval writers conceived this habit to be sinful. The opinions of many theologians have been collected by Debreyne who in his *Moechialogie* (pp. 149-163) deals fully with the question.

The early Penitentials took into consideration this matter and prescribed penance for the voluntary emission of semen through the influence of the mind. The penance was graded, according to the ecclesiastic office of the offender. The Penitentials refer particularly to the occurrence of the *Delectatio* within the Church edifice.

Spontaneous orgasm in women was also known during the Middle Ages. Various theologic writers refer to its occurrence. Practically no contribution was made towards the understanding of the physiology and pathology of these processes until modern times.

THE JOURNAL OF SEXOLOGY AND PSYCHANALYSIS is published bi-monthly during January, March, May, July, September and November. *Subscription price* \$5.00 per annum in the United States; in foreign countries, the equivalent of \$5.00. No extra charge for postage anywhere.

Price of single copies of the current issue \$1.00; of back copies, as far as available \$1.50.

Manuscripts and books for review may be sent either to DR. WM. J. ROBINSON, 12 Mt. Morris Park West, New York City, or to DR. S. A. TANNENBAUM, 3681 Broadway, New York City.

All matters pertaining to subscriptions should be addressed to The American Sexanalytic Press, 12 Mt. Morris Park West, New York City.

The Journal is intended for earnest students of sex problems and for those interested in understanding the motives of human conduct.

The Journal of Sexology and Psychanalysis will carry no advertisements of any kind.